

NEVADA (revised)

Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

**for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)**

DUE: May 1, 2003



**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202**

Instructions for Completing Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

By January 31, 2003, States must complete and submit to the Department this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. We understand that some of the critical elements for the key principles may still be under consideration and may not yet be final State policy by the January 31 due date. States that do not have final approval for some of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31 should, when completing the Workbook, indicate the status of each element which is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400
(202) 401-0113

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

Instructions

The following chart is an overview of States' implementation of the critical elements required for approval of their State accountability systems. States must provide detailed implementation information for each of these elements in Part II of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

For each of the elements listed in the following chart, States should indicate the current implementation status in their State using the following legend:

- F:** State has a final policy, approved by all the required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature), for implementing this element in its accountability system.
- P:** State has a proposed policy for implementing this element in its accountability system, but must still receive approval by required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature).
- W:** State is still working on formulating a policy to implement this element in its accountability system.

Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of State Accountability Systems

Status	State Accountability System Element	
Principle 1: All Schools		
F	1.1	Accountability system includes <i>all schools and districts in the state</i> .
P	1.2	Accountability system holds <i>all schools to the same criteria</i> .
P	1.3	Accountability system incorporates the <i>academic achievement standards</i> .
F	1.4	Accountability system provides <i>information in a timely manner</i> .
F	1.5	Accountability system includes <i>report cards</i> .
F	1.6	Accountability system includes <i>rewards and sanctions</i> .
Principle 2: All Students		
F	2.1	The accountability system includes <i>all students</i>
P	2.2	The accountability system has a consistent definition of <i>full academic year</i> .
P	2.3	The accountability system properly includes <i>mobile students</i> .
Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations		
P	3.1	Accountability system expects <i>all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14</i> .
P	3.2	Accountability system has a method for determining whether <i>student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress</i> .
F	3.2a	Accountability system establishes a <i>starting point</i> .
P	3.2b	Accountability system establishes <i>statewide annual measurable objectives</i> .
P	3.2c	Accountability system establishes <i>intermediate goals</i> .
Principle 4: Annual Decisions		
P	4.1	The accountability system <i>determines annually the progress</i> of schools and districts.

STATUS Legend:

F – Final state policy
P – Proposed policy, awaiting State approval
W – Working to formulate policy

Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability

F	5.1	The accountability system <i>includes all the required student subgroups</i> .
P	5.2	The accountability system holds <i>schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups</i> .
F	5.3	The accountability system includes <i>students with disabilities</i> .
F	5.4	The accountability system includes <i>limited English proficient students</i> .
P	5.5	The State has determined the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used.
P	5.6	The State has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting achievement results and in determining whether schools and LEAs are making adequate yearly progress on the basis of disaggregated subgroups.

Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments

F	6.1	Accountability system is based <i>primarily on academic assessments</i> .
---	-----	---

Principle 7: Additional Indicators

P	7.1	Accountability system includes <i>graduation rate for high schools</i> .
F	7.2	Accountability system includes an <i>additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools</i> .
P	7.3	Additional indicators are valid and reliable.

Principle 8: Separate Decisions for Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics

P	8.1	Accountability system holds students, schools and districts separately accountable for <i>reading/language arts and mathematics</i> .
---	-----	---

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

P	9.1	Accountability system produces <i>reliable decisions</i> .
P	9.2	Accountability system produces <i>valid decisions</i> .
P	9.3	State has a plan for addressing <i>changes in assessment and student population</i> .

Principle 10: Participation Rate

P	10.1	Accountability system has a means for calculating the <i>rate of participation</i> in the statewide assessment.
P	10.2	Accountability system has a means for <i>applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools</i> .

STATUS Legend:

F – Final policy

P – Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval

W– Working to formulate policy

PART II: State Response and Activities for Meeting State Accountability System Requirements

Instructions

In Part II of this Workbook, States are to provide detailed information for each of the critical elements required for State accountability systems. States should answer the questions asked about each of the critical elements in the State's accountability system. States that do not have final approval for any of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31, 2003, should, when completing this section of the Workbook, indicate the status of each element that is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

IMPORTANT STATE NOTE

The Nevada Department of Education, acting on behalf of the State of Nevada, is making every effort to revise its current accountability system to bring it into compliance with the No Child Left Behind Act. To accomplish this, the state must modify current statute, current regulation and current policy with respect to accountability and other aspects of education in Nevada. The Nevada Legislature entered into a special session on June 3rd which is expected to last through Sunday June 8th. During that session, Senate Bill 1 (formally Senate Bill 191) was heard and passed and will be introduced into law. The passage of that groundbreaking legislation enables the Department of Education and the State Board of Education to fully implement the NCLB Act

The Nevada Department of Education received a peer review of its tentative consolidated state accountability plan on March 18th, 2003. At the peer review meeting, the state submitted a binder including a comprehensive set of evidence to support its planned system. In the tentative and final workbook plan the state refers throughout to evidence that supports its current and planned efforts. The evidence binder provides an organizational structure classifying evidence by principle and key element. That binder is not being re-submitted at this time. However, peer reviewers commented on the possible inclusion of several pieces of ancillary material. Based on the outcome of the peer review, the Department of Education attached ancillary materials augmenting the evidence submission on April 30, 2003. The Department of Education anticipates that this submission (electronic submission on June 9th, 2003 with follow-up mail submission) it is final plan submission.

Finally, the Nevada Department of Education entered into a waiver agreement with the United States Department of Education following the federal review of its final assessment system to comply with IASA. Nevada has and will continue to fully comply with the requirements of the agreement as it transitions to the new assessment and accountability systems required by NCLB.

PRINCIPLE 1. A single statewide Accountability System applied to all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?</p>	<p>Every public school and LEA is required to make adequate yearly progress and is included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a definition of “public school” and “LEA” for AYP accountability purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State Accountability System produces AYP decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-12), public schools that serve special populations (e.g., alternative public schools, juvenile institutions, state public schools for the blind) and public charter schools. It also holds accountable public schools with no grades assessed (e.g., K-2). 	<p>A public school or LEA is not required to make adequate yearly progress and is not included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State policy systematically excludes certain public schools and/or LEAs.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

The state accountability system and AYP designation process will be applied to every public school and school district in the state without exception. There are approximately 550 schools including programs within schools and there are 17 school districts in the state. The AYP determination process must be modified in order to apply it to non-traditional schools.

A handful of Nevada public schools (3 schools), only serve students in kindergarten through 2nd grade. There are no state mandated large scale assessments covering this grade range. These schools are located within very close proximity to a sister elementary school serving grades 3 through 6. Students attending the K-2 schools matriculate to the sister schools. As a consequence, AYP test performance of the sister schools will be used, along with K-2 other indicator performance (i.e. attendance rate), to determine AYP for the K-2 schools.

Current state statute prevents the aggregation of test scores from alternative school configurations (i.e. alternative programs, special education programs, prison schools) to the school district within which the school resides for reporting purposes. In determining AYP, scores for students enrolled in these schools for a full academic year will be used in making school level AYP determinations. Additionally, scores for students enrolled in alternative programs (27 schools/programs) and special education programs (8 programs) will be aggregated to the school district for district level AYP analyses. For these schools/programs and prison programs (10 schools), regardless of enrollment period, performance data will be aggregated up to the state level for AYP analyses. In Nevada there are several magnet programs that serve students with severe disabilities. During the 2002-2003 school year, scores for students enrolled in these programs for a full academic year or longer will be used to calculate AYP for the school housing the magnet program. However, the State Board of Education will determine how these scores will be treated in subsequent school years. Using the SMART system, scores for these students may be applied to the performance of the schools the students are zoned for.

Charter schools in Nevada (10 schools) are held to the same requirements as all other public schools. School districts or the State Board of Education must sponsor Charter schools. Scores for Charter school students will be used for Charter school determinations and aggregated to the state level for state AYP determination. Although current state statute requires that Charter School performance be reported within and among data reported for the sponsoring school district, Nevada does not anticipate holding sponsoring school districts responsible for Charter School AYP performance.

Clarifying note based on USED review: The State Board of Education is given statutory authority, through passage of Senate Bill 191, to establish the treatment of "special" schools in the AYP determination process. It is expected that the State Board will consider regulation governing this process in the summer of 2003.

All schools, regardless of configuration or student population, will be judged annually relative to AYP using the rules stated in the Nevada plan. It is expected that for the purpose of making LEA AYP designations that the performance of students attending these schools, assuming district enrollment for a full academic year, will be aggregated to the school district. This applies to all "special" schools including charter schools. Although the sponsoring relationship between school district and Charter schools places more distance between them than exists between a school district and traditional school, the school district still retains responsibilities towards the students attending the Charter school. In Nevada, Charter schools are either sponsored by a school district or the State Board of Education. In those few instances in which schools are not sponsored by a school district, only the school and state will be held accountable for student performance within that school.

Evidence: LCE Concept paper, BDR, Existing statute, SMART documentation

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?	<p>All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination.</p> <p>If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.</p>	Some public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of alternate criteria when making an AYP determination.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Indicators to be used in judging AYP include state large scale English language arts assessments and math assessments, an alternative assessment for qualifying IEP students in language arts and math, the possibility of district modified assessments for LEP students in English language arts and math, graduation rates and attendance rates.</p> <p>For all schools and districts, those AYP indicators that are applicable for the grade levels served are included and combined in the AYP determination. For example, for K-5 schools all AYP relevant large-scale assessments (grade 3, 4, and 5 assessments), any use of alternative assessments, the other academic indicators, and participation rates will be combined in making judgments.</p> <p>Evidence: Pre-technical bulletin for accountability, AYP Steps PPT</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?</p>	<p>State has defined three levels of student achievement: <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i>.¹</p> <p>Student achievement levels of <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State's academic content standards; and the <i>basic</i> level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> levels.</p>	<p>Standards do not meet the legislated requirements.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

¹ System of State achievement standards will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review. The Accountability Peer Review will determine that achievement levels are used in determining AYP.

During the 1999-2000 school year, the Nevada State Board of Education adopted academic standards in English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science. The adoption included both content standards and achievement standards (previously termed performance standards). The state adopted four achievement levels including “Exceeds Standard”, “Meets Standard”, “Approaches Standard”, and “Below Standard”. Content and Performance standards can be obtained at the Nevada Department of Education website (www.nde.state.nv.us).

The state tests being used for AYP, and those planned for AYP use, have been designed to produce achievement level scores that are aligned to the state’s achievement standards. In its transitional assessment system under IASA, department Title I staff determined NRT scores that were indicative of proficiency, advanced, and basic relative to the state standards. Until the NRT tests are phased out as AYP measures (2003-04 school year), the previously defined achievement levels used during the transition period will continue.

In the summer of 2002, the department conducted a standard setting using a bookmarking procedure in which performance on the grade 3 and 5 CRTs was aligned to the state’s achievement standards (i.e. approaching, meets, & exceeds) by determining 3 separate cut scores. The State Board of Education adopted these scores with some adjustment and in so doing replaced the “Below Standard” label with “Developing/Emergent”.

In the summer of 2002, the department conducted a standard setting on the 8th grade writing test using a modified bookmarking procedure. The exercise culminated in a slight adjustment to the then current definition of “meets” standard and added to it definitions of “approaches” and “exceeds” standard. There is strong consideration to use the 4th grade writing test as part of AYP, but not before the 2003-04 school year. If an affirmative decision is made, a standard setting procedure will be used to review the current definition of proficiency for that test and to set other achievement level scores in the fall of 2003.

In fall of 2002, the department, using a bookmarking procedure, conducted a standard setting on its high school proficiency examinations. This exercise resulted in definitions of proficiency or “meets” standard. Using a statistical smoothing procedure, the department will define achievement scores for the high school proficiency examinations that are indicative of advanced and approaching performance. This will be completed during the summer of 2003.

The department anticipates conducting a standard setting on the 8th grade CRT test during the fall of 2003. Using census pilot data gathered in spring 2003, the judgmental procedure will be augmented with approximated impact data. Because this test will be a critical accountability measure beginning in the 2003-04 school year and because of the reporting/AYP cycles, it is not practical to wait until after the first “live” administration to set standards.

The achievement levels used in Nevada are designed to align to and connote the same meaning implied by the achievement levels described in NCLB. A crosswalk is provided below.

NCLB	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
Nevada	Developing/Emergent	Approaches	Meets	Exceeds

Evidence: Board document and Board action report, Standard setting technical manuals

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?	<p>State provides decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions before the beginning of the next academic year.</p> <p>State allows enough time to notify parents about public school choice or supplemental educational service options, time for parents to make an informed decision, and time to implement public school choice and supplemental educational services.</p>	Timeline does not provide sufficient time for LEAs to fulfill their responsibilities before the beginning of the next academic year.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

The requirement for reporting assessment results and accountability information prior to the beginning of the following school year prompts change in Nevada. In addition to current state statute that requires accountability reporting in the spring of each school year, the state has many schools that have multi-track and year-round schedules. The current administration schedule for the 3, 5, and 8 CRT program is based on instructional days and, hence, allows some schools to take the “spring” tests after the beginning of the subsequent school year for others (2nd week in July).

The state’s plan is to move the testing window back in the “spring” semester and to narrow the current testing window. Currently the window is two weeks either side of the 165th day of instruction. The administration schedule will be narrowed and targeted to the 130th to 140th day of instruction. (Because of contractual obligations, the change in administration schedule could not occur before the 2003-2004 school year.)

The inability to make the contractual change prior to the 2003-04 school year means that designations for the 2002-03 school year will come later in the summer and into the fall than planned for the 2003-04 designations. There are 35 schools in Nevada that potentially could be identified as in need of improvement based on 2002-03 performance. For approximately 10 of these schools, the CRT administration will not be completed until the first week of August (multi-track 165th day of instruction). The timing of the designations for these schools can not occur until late September. If any of these schools are identified as in need of improvement, choice and, if appropriate, supplemental service provisions will occur at the semester break. For the remaining approximated 25 schools the timing of the AYP designations should occur allowing time for choice to be implemented prior to the beginning of the school year.

The state intends to make final AYP decisions, disseminate “choice” letters, and disseminate the state report card prior to the beginning of each school year. The target for final AYP decisions and the dissemination of “choice” letters is no later than two weeks prior to the beginning of the school year, on a school-by-school basis. The target for dissemination of the state report card is August 15th. Local report cards are expected to have the same dissemination date.

Outlined below is a general estimate of the time sequence involved from test administration through the school/school district improvement process.

March 15 – April 28	Test window and answer documents to test vendor
May 31	Vendor completes all assessment reporting
June 15	Department/LEAS make preliminary designations
July 21	Appeal window is completed
August 1	Districts issue “choice” letters
August 15	Department formally disseminates final determinations and releases report cards
October 31	End date for schools/school districts to submit improvement plans
December 15	Review of improvement plans is completed School/school district improvement plans implemented

Given the general timeline, the greatest concern is the issuance of choice letters to parents of students enrolled in schools beginning instruction prior to the August 1st “choice” letter dissemination date. For these 16 schools, 7 of which are Title I served, an attempt will be made to conduct AYP analyses early in the process to enable issuance of choice letters at least two full weeks prior to the beginning of school.

Evidence: BDR, Current regulation, Multi-Track/Year-round schedules

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?	<p>The State Report Card includes all the required data elements [see Appendix A for the list of required data elements].</p> <p>The State Report Card is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year.</p> <p>The State Report Card is accessible in languages of major populations in the State, to the extent possible.</p> <p>Assessment results and other academic indicators (including graduation rates) are reported by student subgroups</p>	<p>The State Report Card does not include all the required data elements.</p> <p>The State Report Card is not available to the public.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>The state produces a State Report Card. The State Report Card issued in the 2002-2003 school year (12/14/02) contains all NCLB required elements available on that date. The report card will be revised to include the remaining NCLB required elements for the 2002-2003 dissemination expected to occur in August of 2003.</p> <p>The Department of Education is in receipt of a legislative letter of intent directing the development of uniform reporting at the state, school district, and school levels. The Department will be meeting with its accountability technical advisory committee, comprised of state and local accountability staff as well as national experts, in spring of 2003 to begin the process of designing uniform report formats and report contents for all report cards. Uniform reports may not be possible until the 2003-04 dissemination (August 2004).</p> <p>State Report Cards are produced in the Spanish language in addition to the English language. Report cards are disseminated in multiple ways including ground mail, newspaper excerpts, and web-delivery. State, school district, and school report cards should also be available in school buildings and school district and state administrative offices. The initial dissemination of these reports is expected to occur on August 15 of each year.</p> <p>Evidence: State Report Card, template for following year, letter of intent</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs? ²	<p>State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set by the State; • Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and, • Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs. 	State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.

² The state must provide rewards and sanctions for all public schools and LEAs for making adequate yearly progress, except that the State is not required to hold schools and LEAs not receiving Title I funds to the requirements of section 1116 of NCLB [§200.12(b)(40)].

--	--	--

As allowed by federal statute, certain sanctions required by NCLB will apply only to Title I served schools and Title I served LEAs. Nevada includes 17 school districts, all of whom receive Title I assistance, so all school districts (LEAs) are subject to the sanction/corrective action schedule outlined in the NCLB Act. Within the school districts, only those schools receiving Title I assistance must have sanctions applied following continued AYP failure.

Continued AYP failure is predicated on continuous failure relative to a specific subject area. For example, a school that fails to meet the status and relative growth thresholds in language arts in year 1 and repeats this failure in language arts in year 2 would be classified as needing improvement. If in year 1 a school fails relative to language arts but meets the math requirements and in year 2 meets the language arts requirements, the school would not be classified as needing improvement irrespective of math performance in year 2. Likewise, for a school to be identified as needing improvement based on “other indicator” performance, failure with respect to the other indicator must occur in two consecutive years. If the deciding factor in moving a school into improvement is the other indicator, the classification for improvement is not tied to a specific subject area but is considered as a more general failure.

All schools and school districts, regardless of receipt of Title I funding, that fail to make AYP for two consecutive years will be identified as “needing improvement” and will be required to develop a school (district) improvement plan.³ The critical elements to be included in the plan will be determined through statute and by the SEA and will comply with NCLB requirements. All schools and school districts that fail to make AYP for two consecutive years will also be provided technical assistance. Technical assistance providers include school districts, the SEA, and other statutorily authorized entities.

Schools receiving Title I assistance, identified as “needing improvement”, will be required to offer school choice. After a third consecutive year of school failure to make AYP, school districts, on behalf of Title I served schools, will have to provide supplemental services in addition to school choice. For subsequent years of school failure among Title I served schools, the corrective action schedule outlined in NCLB will be followed. The corrective action schedule outlined in NCLB will also be followed for identified school districts.

Although not required by state statute, state statute will permit the SEA to take progressive corrective actions, similar to those outlined within NCLB, for non-Title I served schools.

State statute will outline a reward schedule to be followed based on AYP performance and performance on other accountability indicators. All schools and school districts will be eligible for recognition as exemplary or high achieving schools/school districts. Consistent with current state statute and the state’s current process of recognizing high achieving schools, schools and school districts receiving such honors will be publicly recognized through formal ceremony. A similar recognition process will be established to recognize high achieving school districts.

PRINCIPLE 2. All students are included in the State Accountability System.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?	<p>All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>The definitions of “public school” and “LEA” account for all students enrolled in the public school district, regardless of program or type of public school.</p>	Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>As specified in state statute, all students in the state enrolled in public schools are included in the accountability system. This includes all students served in special programs such as court-ordered detention programs, special education magnet programs and alternative school sites.</p> <p>All students in the state must be included in the state assessment process. No exemptions from participation are allowed. Students will participate in the state large-scale assessments and/or state sponsored alternate testing programs (i.e. SCAANS assessment for the severely cognitively impaired). Note that this is a shift from past Nevada policy. Nevada in past years allowed exemptions for special education students based on IEP requirements and for some LEP students. Bills being considered by the 2003 Legislature will disallow any exemptions. Changes to state regulation to support the new statute will follow suit in the summer of 2003.</p> <p>Although AYP calculations for schools will be based on those students having been enrolled for a full academic year (this would also apply to the district for district level AYP decisions), the scores for all students tested will be reported in accountability tables along with documentation of participation rates.</p> <p>Evidence: Current statute and regulation, BDR</p>		

³ State Note: All schools, school districts, and the state, regardless of AYP performance, are required to develop/revise improvement plans annually.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?	<p>The State has a definition of “full academic year” for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.</p>	<p>LEAs have varying definitions of “full academic year.”</p> <p>The State’s definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Assuming a spring test window, students enrolled in a school on the state’s official enrollment count day (approximately October 1st) and who remain continuously enrolled in the same school up to and during the spring testing window are considered to have been in school for a full academic year. The same rule applies to enrollment within the school district. Therefore, a student that is continuously enrolled in a school district from count day through the test window, regardless of movement between multiple schools within the district, is considered to have been in the district for a full academic year.</p> <p>Evidence: Statute</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?</p>	<p>State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year.</p> <p>State holds LEAs accountable for students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school within the district to another public school within the district.</p>	<p>State definition requires students to attend the same public school for more than a full academic year to be included in public school accountability.</p> <p>State definition requires students to attend school in the same district for more than a full academic year to be included in district accountability.</p> <p>State holds public schools accountable for students who have not attended the same public school for a full academic year.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>State policy requires that test answer documents be completed for every student enrolled in a school/program during the testing window. Included on the score sheet are two elements to be completed by authorized school/school district personnel. School/school district personnel must code the extent of time a student has been enrolled in the school and school district (see example score sheet and administration manual).</p> <p>Coding of these elements should be based on information contained in the SIS/SMART system. The SEA will compare enrollment numbers based on score sheets to enrollment numbers from count day. In those instances in which a discrepancy between counts exists of 4% or greater, schools and school districts will be asked to formally explain the difference. The SEA may conduct formal audits if significant discrepancies between coded responses and count day figures cannot be accounted for by schools/school districts.</p> <p>Evidence: Example answer documents, SMART dictionary.</p>		

PRINCIPLE 3. State definition of AYP is based on expectations for growth in student achievement that is continuous and substantial, such that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than 2013-2014.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.1 How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?	The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement in reading/language arts ⁴ and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.	State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014. State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Based on reading, language, and math performance among 3rd, 4th, 5th, 8th, and high school students in the 2001-2002 school year, baseline proficiency levels were determined separately for elementary, middle, and high schools. For each school level, baseline performance was established separately for English language arts and math using the school percentile method outlined as one of two options in the NCLB Act. The school percentile method resulted in greater percentages of proficiency than did the subpopulation method.</p> <p>The baseline levels of percent proficient were subtracted from 100% and then divided by 12 to determine the necessary annual increases in percent proficient in order to move all students to proficiency in the twelve year time period.</p> <p>Evidence: Board PPT, Excel spreadsheets</p>		

⁴ If the state has separate assessments to cover its language arts standards (e.g., reading and writing), the State must create a method to include scores from all the relevant assessments.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?</p>	<p>For a public school and LEA to make adequate yearly progress, each student subgroup must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives, each student subgroup must have at least a 95% participation rate in the statewide assessments, and the school must meet the State's requirement for other academic indicators.</p> <p>However, if in any particular year the student subgroup does not meet those annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA may be considered to have made AYP, if the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year decreased by 10% of that percentage from the preceding public school year; that group made progress on one or more of the State's academic indicators; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment.</p>	<p>State uses different method for calculating how public schools and LEAs make AYP.</p>

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>A four step sequence is followed in determining AYP for the school or school district, with the four step sequence being repeated by subject area and by each identifiable subgroup within the school or school district.</p> <p>The general four step sequence is described below. To illustrate, we consider <u>English Language Arts</u> performance among economically disadvantaged (Low SES) 4th grade students within an elementary school:</p> <p>Step 1 → Compare Low SES test participation rate to the 95% participation rate criterion. If subpopulation rate is less than 95%, school is identified as having failed AYP in English Language Arts. If subpopulation rate is 95% or more, move to step 2.</p> <p>Step 2 → Compare Low SES percentage of proficient students against the annual threshold target. If subpopulation scores at or above this level, begin application of AYP sequence to the next subpopulation. If subpopulation scores below the standard, move to step 3.</p> <p>Step 3 → Compare Low SES current percentage of proficient students to the Low SES percentage of proficient students from the previous school year. If the change is equivalent to or greater than a 10% reduction in the percentage of non-proficient students for the subpopulation, move to step 4. If subpopulation's percentage is reduced by less than 10%, the school is categorized as failing AYP in English Language Arts.</p> <p>Step 4 → Compare Low SES average daily attendance rate to the annual threshold target. If the subpopulation's rate is at or above the target or below the target but has increased in comparison to the previous school year, begin application of the 4 step sequence to the next subpopulation. If subpopulation rate is below target with no improvement, the school can be categorized as having failed AYP. (Special Note: Step four must be taken for the school as a whole regardless of step 2 and/or step 3 performance).</p> <p>Note: The same sequence is followed for each subject area and for each subpopulation. This means that a successful school with 8 identifiable subpopulations must successfully make it through a minimum of 37 comparisons but may require as many as 63. By contrast, a school can fail as a result of a single comparison.</p> <p>Although a school can fail with any negative comparison, all 63 comparisons will have to be made on an annual basis to provide complete profile information for schools and school districts. This must be done in part to meet the state's obligation to provide technical assistance relative to the school/school district improvement process.</p> <p>For full explanation of the AYP process, see the accountability pre-technical bulletin.</p> <p>Evidence: Board action, Accountability plan pre-technical bulletin, AYP Steps PPT</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?</p>	<p>Using data from the 2001-2002 school year, the State established separate starting points in reading/language arts and mathematics for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State's proficient level of academic achievement.</p> <p>Each starting point is based, at a minimum, on the higher of the following percentages of students at the proficient level: (1) the percentage in the State of proficient students in the lowest-achieving student subgroup; or, (2) the percentage of proficient students in a public school at the 20th percentile of the State's total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level.</p> <p>A State may use these procedures to establish separate starting points by grade span; however, the starting point must be the same for all like schools (e.g., one same starting point for all elementary schools, one same starting point for all middle schools...).</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses a different method for calculating the starting point (or baseline data).</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS												
<p>Performance data from the 2001-02 school year were used to establish the baseline for all schools. As stated previously, both methods for establishing baselines were explored but the school percentile method resulted in the higher proficiency levels. (See critical element 9.3 for how state handles baseline and changes to state assessment system.)</p> <p>Test scores for tests administered in grades 3, 4, 5, 8, and at the high school level were used to establish baseline. The information gained from tests administered in grades 3, 4, and 5 was combined to establish the elementary state baseline. When multiple tests within a single domain were administered in the same grade (i.e. 8th grade reading, language, and writing), information was combined across tests to set the state baseline. For high school, cumulative performance up to and including spring assessments were considered.</p> <p>The following is a breakdown of the baseline proficiency rates by grade levels and subject area.</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>Elementary</td><td>Middle</td><td>High School</td></tr><tr><td>English Language Arts</td><td>32.4%</td><td>37.0%</td><td>91.0%</td></tr><tr><td>Mathematics</td><td>37.3%</td><td>38.0%</td><td>58.0%</td></tr></table> <p>The state baselines are used to set the trajectory for the 12 year timeline and to establish the annual “status” targets.</p> <p>Evidence: State Board PPT</p>				Elementary	Middle	High School	English Language Arts	32.4%	37.0%	91.0%	Mathematics	37.3%	38.0%	58.0%
	Elementary	Middle	High School											
English Language Arts	32.4%	37.0%	91.0%											
Mathematics	37.3%	38.0%	58.0%											

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>State has annual measurable objectives that are consistent with a state's intermediate goals and that identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State's academic assessments.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses another method for calculating annual measurable objectives.</p> <p>The State Accountability System does not include annual measurable objectives.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>As indicated above, using the baseline proficiency levels and the 12 year time limit, measurable annual objectives have been established statewide at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Proficiency levels are established separately for English Language Arts and Mathematics. See intermediate goals for a fuller explanation.</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?	<p>State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year. •Each following incremental increase occurs within three years. 	<p>The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals.</p> <p>The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS				EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS	
The state has chosen to use intermediate proficiency goals with 6 equal distant increases. The baseline estimates will be used as annual targets for two years with the first increase occurring in the 2004-2005 school year. The subsequent increases will occur in the 2007-2008, 2009-2010, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 school years. Using baseline figures as the starting point, a schedule of increases by school type and subject area is provided below.						
	Elementary School		Middle School		High School	
	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math
Baseline	32.4%	37.3%	37.0%	38.0%	91.0%	58.0%
2002-03	32.4%	37.3%	37.0%	38.0%	91.0%	58.0%
2003-04	32.4%	37.3%	37.0%	38.0%	91.0%	58.0%
2004-05	43.7%	47.7%	47.5%	48.3%	92.5%	65.0%
2005-06	43.7%	47.7%	47.5%	48.3%	92.5%	65.0%
2006-07	43.7%	47.7%	47.5%	48.3%	92.5%	65.0%
2007-08	55.0%	58.1%	58.0%	58.6%	94.0%	72.0%
2008-09	55.0%	58.1%	58.0%	58.6%	94.0%	72.0%
2009-10	66.3%	68.5%	68.5%	68.9%	95.5%	79.0%
2010-11	66.3%	68.5%	68.5%	68.9%	95.5%	79.0%
2011-12	77.6%	78.9%	79.0%	79.2%	97.0%	86.0%
2012-13	88.9%	89.3%	89.5%	89.5%	98.5%	93.0%
2013-14	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

It should be noted that NCLB does not require the final assessment system to be fully implemented until the 2005-06 school year. The state anticipates including one or two new assessments in 2003-04 with the full implementation occurring in 2005-06 in compliance with NCLB. Although the state expects that all students will be proficient by the 2013-2014 school year irrespective of when the final assessment system is implemented, it intends to adjust the annual performance targets after any substantive changes to the set of assessments being used to determine AYP. Therefore, adjustments to the trajectory are expected to occur during the 2003-04 school year and after the 2005-06 school year.

PRINCIPLE 4. State makes annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?	AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually. ⁵	AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Currently, annual school accountability designations are made for every public school in the state. Although designations will continue to be made on an annual basis, the timing of designations from the state's current structure will change, and the designations will be applied to all schools within the state as well as local school districts and the state as a whole.</p> <p>State statute will define in broad terms the timeframe within which designations must occur including the release of the State Report Card. The Department and school districts intend to make designations prior to the beginning of each school year, based upon performance in the previous school year.</p> <p>Evidence: See current statute and BDR.</p>		

⁵ Decisions may be based upon several years of data and data may be averaged across grades within a public school [§1111(b)(2)(J)].

PRINCIPLE 5. All public schools and LEAs are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?	<p>Identifies subgroups for defining adequate yearly progress: economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency.</p> <p>Provides definition and data source of subgroups for adequate yearly progress.</p>	State does not disaggregate data by each required student subgroup.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>The sequence of comparisons to determine AYP status is applied at the total school or school district level and at the subpopulation level. Subpopulation comparisons will be made for five ethnicities (American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, African American, and White), economically disadvantaged students, students with limited English proficiency, and students with disabilities.</p> <p>For any school or school district, too few students in any of the above identified categories would eliminate that subgroup from comparisons.</p> <p>Evidence: Board PPT, AYP Steps PPT</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?	Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for student subgroup achievement: economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students.	State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Student subgroups, including the school/school district as a whole, are held to status and relative growth requirements as outlined in NCLB. For those subpopulations not making the status threshold, a comparison will be made of the percentage of proficient students in the current year to the percentage of proficient students in the prior year. If the change reflects a 10% or greater reduction in the percentage of non-proficient students, the school/subpopulation will have made the relative growth requirement (safe harbor).</p> <p>In addition to considering participation rates and the language arts and math performance, the school or school district as a whole, and each subpopulation for which relative growth comparisons are required, performance relative to the other indicator will be considered.</p> <p>For a fuller explanation of the AYP determination process, the reader is referred to the accountability pre-technical bulletin.</p> <p>Evidence: Board PPT and other documents, AYP Steps PPT, Accountability plan pre-technical bulletin</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>All students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or an alternate assessment based on grade level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p> <p>State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System or State policy excludes students with disabilities from participating in the statewide assessments.</p> <p>State cannot demonstrate that alternate assessments measure grade-level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>All students enrolled in public schools are included in the state accountability and assessment system. Students with disabilities can be included in various ways. First, students with disabilities can be included in the same manner as non-disabled students. Second, students with disabilities can be included in the assessment system using accommodations. Testing accommodations used on the state tests must be consistent with accommodations typically used by the student in regular classroom activities and can only be considered permissible if they do not invalidate the interpretation of test performance. Third, students with severe cognitive disabilities are eligible to participate in the state’s alternate assessment (SCAAN). The SCAAN assessment is linked to the state’s content standards but also includes functional standards. The assessment does allow for achievement designations paralleling those used on traditional state large-scale assessments.</p> <p>Nevada estimates/approximates that 2% of its special education population is eligible to participate on the SCAAN assessment. This is well below the federal <i>interim regulatory process</i> requirement of 1% of the total student population. If it is determined that a student is not eligible to take SCAAN and that the accommodations needed to participate on the large-scale assessments invalidate score interpretation, students testing using non-permissible accommodations will receive a developing/emergent achievement level score. They will, however, be counted as having participated.</p> <p>Determining the route through which students with disabilities participate in the state assessment system is handled in large part by the student’s IEP committee. The process is facilitated by use of an IEP “decision-maker” that forces the committee to address critical questions that must be answered before testing decisions can be made.</p> <p>Students with disabilities participating in any manner outlined above are counted as having participated in the state testing system. As illustrated below, for AYP, student achievement levels (i.e. exceeds standard, meets standard, approaches standard, etc...) earned on SCAAN are counted just as are achievement levels for student results on the state large-scale assessments.</p> <div style="text-align: center;"> <pre> graph TD subgraph Overall_AYP [Overall AYP] D[Developing Emergent] A[Approaching] M[Meets (proficient)] E[Exceeds] end subgraph SCAAN [SCAAN Assessment] S1[Dev/Emr] S2[Approach] S3[Meet] S4[Exceed] end subgraph Traditional [Traditional Assessment] T1[Dev/Emr] T2[Approach] T3[Meet] T4[Exceed] end S1 --> D S1 --> A S1 --> M S1 --> E S2 --> D S2 --> A S2 --> M S2 --> E S3 --> D S3 --> A S3 --> M S3 --> E S4 --> D S4 --> A S4 --> M S4 --> E T1 --> D T1 --> A T1 --> M T1 --> E T2 --> D T2 --> A T2 --> M T2 --> E T3 --> D T3 --> A T3 --> M T3 --> E T4 --> D T4 --> A T4 --> M T4 --> E </pre> </div>		
<p>Evidence: SCAAN documentation and participation rates, statute and regulation, IEP decision maker, lists of testing accommodations (test manual: appendix).</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?</p>	<p>All LEP student participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or a native language version of the general assessment based on grade level standards.</p> <p>State demonstrates that LEP students are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>LEP students are not fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>Students are classified as having limited English proficiency (LEP) based on a home language survey and the results of annual assessment in English proficiency. The home language test used for this purpose is designed to meet the Title III testing requirements and is distinct from the content area assessments being used in the AYP determination process.</p> <p>With the exception of students eligible for the SCAAN assessment, all students are expected to participate on the state large-scale assessments regardless of LEP status. For students identified as LEP (as determined by the annual Title III test) who have been in the country for fewer than 3 years, local school districts may choose to use modified content area assessments. On a case by case basis, this option can be extended for up to two additional years.</p> <p>If a school district uses this option and can demonstrate the technical quality of the modified assessment(s) (to include information pertaining to the reliability of test scores and the alignment of the instrument to state content standards), and demonstrate that the assessments produce achievement level categories aligned with the state's achievement standards, scores based on the modified assessment can be submitted to the state for AYP analysis. If the school district does not opt to use modified assessment or for students who have been in the U.S. for more than a 3-year period, participation on the state large-scale assessments is required.</p> <p>Plan for including district option: The state does not anticipate any use of alternate/modified assessments at the district level for this subpopulation of students in the 2002-03 school year. If a district were to take advantage of this option during the 2002-03 school year, the information from the alternate assessment will have to be submitted as part of an appeal process. Beginning with the 2003-04 school year, the Nevada Department of Education will publish material that prescribes the technical characteristics of an alternate assessment that the state will review prior to accepting the instrument as an alternative to the state large-scale assessments, an application form for using the alternate assessment, and roster sheets. After receiving approval from the Nevada Department of Education to use a particular instrument, on or before February 1 of each school year, school districts will be required to submit roster sheets listing the students, by school, who will be participating in an approved alternate LEP assessment. The achievement level earned on a LEP alternate assessment is treated the same as an achievement level earned on a traditional large-scale assessment.</p> <p>For students participating in the traditional state assessments, a series of accommodations, including those linguistic in nature, are provided. The use of accommodations should make access to the state testing program more available and the testing experience more meaningful. As is the case with special education students, the choice of accommodations is predicated on typical classroom experience and the interaction between the accommodation and the validity of the test score interpretations.</p> <p>Evidence: Test manuals; accommodation appendices</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?	<p>State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.⁶</p> <p>Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>	<p>State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes.</p> <p>Definition is not applied consistently across the State.</p> <p>Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

⁶ The minimum number is not required to be the same for reporting and accountability.

For reporting purposes, the state will continue to use existing policy which sets the minimum at 10 students. State regulation sets a lower limit of 5 students but test reporting and accountability reporting policy has been 10 students. Regulations will be revised to reflect the reporting N (n = 10) during the summer of 2003.

In making AYP calculations, for any group of 25 or more students, a statistical test will be conducted to determine if a threshold level of performance (Status) has been met. The statistical test will be a one-tailed comparison to determine if the upper-boundary of observed performance meets or exceeds the predetermined status threshold. The level of confidence for these comparisons will be controlled at .95. The production and use of “look-up” tables will aid in the transparency of these comparisons. For annual “status” comparisons (step 2 in the AYP comparison sequence), the standard error of the proportion with a z-score transformation will be used in defining the controlled one-tailed 95% confidence limit rate. For relative growth comparisons (step 3 in the sequence), the standard error of the difference between proportions will be used. In making these comparisons, a z-score transformation controlling the one-tailed 75% confidence limit will be used. (a Note that accounting for sampling error for safe harbor is critical. “Gain” scores or “difference” scores are known to be less reliable than static observations. Reliable interpretation of gain must take into account error). It is understood that the impact on 2002-03 classifications of using the confidence interval for the relative growth comparisons will be studied jointly by USED and the Nevada Department of Education.

For schools/school districts falling below the n = 25 threshold in a given school year, performance data will be collapsed across adjacent school years until the n = 25 threshold is met, but for no more than three consecutive years. Once the threshold is met, the same series of statistical tests applied to larger schools will be conducted to evaluate AYP performance. For the school year in which the school n-size does not meet the n = 25 threshold, additional criteria will be considered in the AYP review. Additional criteria include ancillary standards based performance data. Performance data directly aligned with the state’s content and achievement standards and that yields reliable achievement level information will be considered.

Small schools will be allowed to submit aggregate performance data from local assessments/observations that are established to be tied directly to the state content and achievement standards that produce reliable scores. Guidance for this process cannot be developed and issued to schools until the beginning of the 2003-04 school year. Because of this, for 2002-03 AYP judgments, the review of ancillary materials will not occur. Small schools will be judged based on large-scale performance (including participation rate and other indicator performance) only. If schools receive a negative classification, the classification will be asterisked in formal reports indicating that the judgment was based on “unstable” performance data. For schools subsequently identified as in need of improvement, they will have an opportunity to refute the first year analysis by presenting ancillary performance information.

For 2003-04 and years after, the small school review will occur during the Spring of the school year just previous to or during the review period for other schools.

The n = 25 threshold will create an impact on the state. The table below illustrates the impact at the total school level based on school size.

	Less than 25	25 or more
Elementary School	26 (8.3%)	287
Middle School	32 (26.7%)	88
High School	36 (34.0%)	70

NCLB sanctions are only being applied to Title I schools. Therefore, impact is mitigated. No stand alone high schools are Title I served and 12 stand alone middle schools are served. Of the 12 middle schools, all have more than 25 students per grade level. There are a handful of combined schools that are served and several of these schools have fewer than 25 students when we collapse the enrollment by grade levels (i.e. elementary, middle, high school). It appears that less than 2% of schools statewide are both Title I served and have fewer than 25 students.

Evidence: Regulation, test contract (reporting), Board recommendation/ action, AYP Steps PPT

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?	Definition does not reveal personally identifiable information. ⁷	Definition reveals personally identifiable information.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>The minimum reporting N (n = 10) should, in almost all instances, protect the privacy of individual students. However, regulation will be established that will allow the masking of released scores for any size subpopulation if all students score within the same achievement level. For example, if all students in a school were to score in the proficient range, released results may be masked by indicating that all students scored at or above the proficient achievement level. Regulation supporting this reporting contingency is expected to be adopted in summer of 2003.</p>		

⁷ The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) prohibits an LEA that receives Federal funds from releasing, without the prior written consent of a student's parents, any personally identifiable information contained in a student's education record.

PRINCIPLE 6. State definition of AYP is based primarily on the State’s academic assessments.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
6.1 How is the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments.⁸</p> <p>Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.</p>	Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

⁸ State Assessment System will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review Team.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Nevada's final assessment system will not be implemented until the 2005-2006. General specifications for the final assessment system are expected to emerge from the 2003 Legislative session ending June 2nd, 2003. Currently and after full implementation, assessment in English language arts and math will be the primary AYP indicators. The following is a breakdown of the assessments to be used for AYP determinations in 1) the 2002-03 school year, 2) the 2003-04 & 2004-05 school years, and 3) the 2005-06 school year and beyond.

Grade	2002-03	2003-04 & 2004-05	2005-06 +
3	CRT—R & M	CRT—R & M	CRT—R & M
4	NRT ^a —R, L, & M	Writing (analytic)	CRT—R & M Writing (analytic)
5	CRT—R & M	CRT—R & M	CRT—R & M
6			CRT—R & M
7	NRT ^a —R, L, & M		CRT—R & M
8	Writing (analytic)	Writing (analytic) CRT—R & M	Writing (analytic) CRT—R & M
High School	HSPE ^b —R, W, & M	HSPE ^b —R, W, & M	HSPE ^b —R, W, & M

CRT = Criterion-referenced test; NRT = Norm-referenced test; HSPE = High School Proficiency Exam
R = Reading; L = Language; W = Writing (holistic); M = Math

^a During the 2002-03 school year, a nationally norm-referenced test (ITBS) is being used in the AYP determination process. This is being done for several reasons. First, until state legislation is passed (currently in session) formally removing the NRT as the primary indicator for school designation, the department does not have authority to ignore the state mandate. Second, current statute and the Title I transition plan for assessment under IASA provided achievement level definitions aligning NRT scores to state performance standards. Third, schools and school districts have relied on NRTs as the primary school accountability measure since the 1997-98 school year. Given the timing of the passage of NCLB and the issuance of supporting regulation, too little time was available to notice schools and school districts with the change in assessment requirements. The final and related reason, NCLB requires states to develop baseline estimates using data from the 2001-02 school year. As a result, the state of Nevada has had to rely heavily on NRT performance for these initial estimates. The state does not anticipate using NRT performance in the AYP determination process after the 2002-03 school year.

^b The state of Nevada has a long history of using high school examinations for student accountability. Students must pass a series of rigorous standards-based assessments in reading, writing, and math to earn a standard high school diploma. Assessments target 12th grade benchmarks. In administering "exit" examinations, Nevada adheres closely to the Standards for Educational and Psychological Measurement. This includes providing students with multiple opportunities to pass the individual tests. Although tied to 12th grade benchmarks, students are provided opportunities for reading and math tests beginning in grade 10 and the writing test in grade 11. There is no guarantee, however, that all students have had the opportunity to learn all prerequisite material until the Spring of their 12th grade year. State regulation requires a certain number of credits to be earned to classify students by grade in high school but it does not specify what courses must be taken and in what sequence. It does require 3 full years of math and 4 years of ELA and as a result, the great majority of students are still learning the material covered on the high school exit examinations throughout the 12th grade school year. Supporting this is the fact that the majority of students do not pass all sections of the high school tests until Spring of their 12th grade year. Nevada is opting to use the "exit" examinations to fulfill the NCLB school accountability requirements at the high school level. Based on USED review of its system, Nevada agrees to use cumulative pass rates up to and including the 11th grade April administration for a given graduating class. A cohort's numerator for the performance estimate would include the sum of those students having passed the examinations on each state administration leading up and including the April administration and the denominator would include all students counted in the numerator and all students participating in the 11th grade April administration. There is no intent to choose a students "best" performance for accountability designations (Note: The number of students who have dropped out of school is controlled through the Graduation Rate other indicator). Nevada understands that once it has an efficient cohort tracking mechanism in place, the extension of the cohort analysis through grade 12 will be considered.

La Marca, Ph.D., revised draft-6/06/03

Evidence: Pre-technical bulletin for accountability, Board PPT, HSPE test calendar

PRINCIPLE 7. State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public High schools and an additional indicator selected by the State for public Middle and public Elementary schools (such as attendance rates).

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?</p>	<p>State definition of graduation rate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculates the percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the state's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or, • Uses another more accurate definition that has been approved by the Secretary; and • Must avoid counting a dropout as a transfer. <p>Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause⁹ to make AYP.</p>	<p>State definition of public high school graduation rate does not meet these criteria.</p>

⁹ See USC 6311(b)(2)(I)(i), and 34 C.F.R. 200.20(b)

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

To determine graduation rate in Nevada, the NCES definition of completion rate which incorporates completers and dropouts will be adapted. “Completers” include standard and advanced diploma recipients, adjusted diploma recipients, and certificate of attendance recipients. Graduation rate only counts diploma recipient completers in the numerator excluding adjusted diploma recipients. The denominator includes all diploma recipients, certificate of attendance recipients, dropouts (9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th), and GED recipients.

For the 2001-2002 school year, graduation rate is equal to^a:

$$\frac{\text{\# of Diploma recipients (01-02) (excluding adjusted diploma recipients)}}{\text{\# of diploma recipients (01-02) (all recipients) + certificate of attendance recipients (01-02) + GED recipients (01-02) + 9th grade dropouts (98-99) + 10th grade dropouts (99-00) + 11th grade dropouts (00-01) + 12th grade dropouts (01-02)}}$$

Graduation rate for a school year can only be established several months after the completion of the school year. This means that for the 2002-2003 AYP designations, graduation rates from the 2001-2002 school year are used.

After complete information is available for the 2001-2002 school year, the state will establish a graduation rate baseline and subsequent threshold targets. In the summer of 2003, the State Board of Education will establish graduation rate thresholds in regulation. For purposes of AYP comparisons, schools will have to demonstrate that they have met the annual threshold or improved toward the threshold in comparison to the previous school year.

The state department will be able to calculate graduation rate for the school as a whole and for each of the five race/ethnicity subpopulations to be used in the 2002-03 AYP determination process. For all remaining subpopulations, graduation rate will be available for use in the AYP determination process during the 2006-07 school year. Until the 2006-07 school year, average daily attendance will be used as a substitute for graduation rate for economically disadvantaged, Limited English proficient, and special education students.

^a Based on formal discussions with the United States Department of Education, Nevada has agreed to revise the formula in two ways. First, IEP students who earn an adjusted diploma will not be recognized, through this formula as having earned a standard diploma. Second, IEP students, if consistent with their IEP, will be given 7 years to earn the standard diploma, as opposed to the 4 years provided to all other students. Third, GED recipients will be added to the denominator of the formula.

Evidence: 2002-2003 State Report Card

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?</p>	<p>State defines the additional academic indicators, e.g., additional State or locally administered assessments not included in the State assessment system, grade-to-grade retention rates or attendance rates.¹⁰</p> <p>An additional academic indicator is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP.</p>	<p>State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

¹⁰ NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>For elementary and middle schools, the state plans to use average daily attendance rate as the single “other” indicator included in making AYP determinations. Attendance rate is currently used in Nevada as a school accountability indicator, and its use will be continued.</p> <p>Note that both graduation rate and attendance rate are used in calculating AYP in two ways. Based on final regulation, an overall comparison of school or school district performance relative to the other indicator must be made (i.e. did the school have 95% ADA or did it improve in ADA based on previous year’s ADA rate). Second, if relative growth (safe harbor) comparisons must be made for any subpopulation, the subpopulation in question must also be judged relative to the other indicator. To fulfill the attendance rate criterion, a school/school district or subpopulation within must maintain status at or above the annual threshold or demonstrate progress toward the goal in comparison to performance in the preceding school year.</p> <p>Current statute requires an average daily attendance of 90% for purposes of school classifications. The State Board of Education will address the attendance threshold in regulation in the summer of 2003.</p> <p>For the 2002-03 school year, average daily attendance can be calculated for all identified subpopulations.</p> <p>Evidence: Current statute, Board recommendation and action report</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?	<p>State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.</p>	<p>State has an academic indicator that is not valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent with nationally recognized standards.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent within grade levels.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>The state's minor adaptation of the formula established by NCES gives confidence that the graduation rate indicator is reliable.</p> <p>For both graduation rate and average daily attendance, data for these comparisons is based upon information collected in the state and school district student information systems. Auditing and quality assurance procedures will be established to better ensure the accuracy of collected data.</p>		

PRINCIPLE 8. AYP is based on reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts	State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs separately	State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs averages or

and mathematics separately for determining AYP?	measures reading/language arts and mathematics. ¹¹ AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.	combines achievement across reading/language arts and mathematics.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>As indicated previously, AYP calculations are based on a sequence of comparisons by school/school district, subpopulation within school/school district, and by language arts and mathematics separately.</p> <p>See accountability pre-technical bulletin for a fuller explanation.</p> <p>Evidence: Board PPT, AYP Steps PPT, Pre-technical bulletin for accountability</p>		

¹¹ If the state has more than one assessment to cover its language arts standards, the State must create a method for including scores from all the relevant assessments.

PRINCIPLE 9. State Accountability System is statistically valid and reliable.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?</p>	<p>State has defined a method for determining an acceptable level of reliability (decision consistency) for AYP decisions.</p> <p>State provides evidence that decision consistency is (1) within the range deemed acceptable to the State, and (2) meets professional standards and practice.</p> <p>State publicly reports the estimate of decision consistency, and incorporates it appropriately into accountability decisions.</p> <p>State updates analysis and reporting of decision consistency at appropriate intervals.</p>	<p>State does not have an acceptable method for determining reliability (decision consistency) of accountability decisions, e.g., it reports only reliability coefficients for its assessments.</p> <p>State has parameters for acceptable reliability; however, the actual reliability (decision consistency) falls outside those parameters.</p> <p>State's evidence regarding accountability reliability (decision consistency) is not updated.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>The state’s choice to use confidence intervals and to conduct statistical tests for “status” and “growth” comparisons is predicated on the need to make reliable AYP determinations. It is predicated on the understanding that measurement error to include sampling error must be considered when making high stakes decisions for schools. The alternative of selecting a single minimum N for the purpose of making AYP determinations is problematic. The necessary n-size, to ensure that all comparisons are reliable, would have to be very large and, hence, would rule out the majority of comparisons, even at the school district level. This would clearly call into question the validity of the classification system. Again, the reliability of accountability decisions is largely driven by sampling error. Conjunctive models are less reliable than compensatory models. Models with many conjunctive decisions, like NCLB, will accumulate larger amounts of misclassification error. For NCLB, school performance, depending on other indicators, can be judged as satisfactory if it meets a status requirement or a growth requirement. Both are equally important and determinations with respect to them must meet educational standards for measurement.</p> <p>Safe harbor "improvement" decisions are more vulnerable to error than status. As stated previously, using confidence intervals is a superior alternative to increasing n-size. It better ensures that more low performing schools will be identified and not “escape” simply because of n-size. It also allows confidence that the identification of a school is done reliably. Reliability in safe harbor decisions is important, not because it will under-identify schools at any one point in time but because, if left uncontrolled, the "bounce" from year to year will cause schools to move in and out of identification ("one year you're good, the next year you're bad").</p> <p>In making statistical comparisons, the state will control the error rate for status with a one-tailed 95% confidence limit. The state has chosen to use a less stringent test for safe harbor (75% controlled rate) but by defining significant in its plan diminishes the plausibility of statistical challenges at a later date. This allows the state to appropriately control misclassifications for the independent statistical comparisons providing a minimum degree of confidence in the classification process. The credibility of an accountability system hinges on consistency in classification and on being able to assist schools after identification. Both depend on reliable classification.</p> <p>Moreover, the state’s decision to combine performance across grade levels and, when applicable, across years, is predicated on reliability considerations. The combination of data across grades and years contributes to the stability of performance estimates.</p> <p>Evidence: AYP Steps PPT, CCSSO Guidance, Linn—CRESST article</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.2 What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?	State has established a process for public schools and LEAs to appeal an accountability decision.	State does not have a system for handling appeals of accountability decisions.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>Reliable decisions and valid interpretations are inextricably linked. Reliability is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for valid interpretations. Therefore, enhancing the reliability of our decisions through the use of statistical tests lends itself to valid AYP interpretations. Additionally, by combining data across grades and school years, the state better ensures that all schools/school districts will be held to the same accountability standards irrespective of school/school district size. It is only through the statistical control of classification decisions that the state will be able to consistently provide technical assistance and school support.</p> <p>Controlling for unreliability is an important step but there remains a high level of concern with the number of comparisons that must be made to determine satisfactory AYP performance and the ability to cogently interpret findings. The conjunctive nature of the NCLB-AYP model and the dependence among the individual comparisons strains the validity of AYP interpretations.</p> <p>To support AYP interpretations, schools/school districts are provided a 30-day appeal period following preliminary designations. Appeals are designed to allow schools and school districts to replicate the AYP calculations and to address differences in state and local findings. Moreover, through the appeal process, schools and school districts can present information, not used directly in the calculation of AYP, that is relevant to school success and that may refute the AYP decision. Appeals will be reviewed using predetermined evaluation criteria. The Nevada Department of Education will work collaboratively with local education agencies to establish acceptable appeal review criteria.</p> <p>Because of the consequences associated with negative AYP decisions, it is critical that a state be able to support the AYP determination process. The foundation for this process is the state assessments. State tests have been carefully designed to measure Nevada state standards and achievement standards. They are built to balance content coverage and test difficulty. Ongoing validity studies are conducted to support the various programs. These efforts provide a strong foundation for deriving support for AYP interpretations.</p> <p>As a secondary support, the state will engage in an annual evaluation of the AYP determination process. This program of study will involve 4 basic steps. 1) Profiles of high achieving and low achieving schools will be developed. The goal is to discern patterns related to sustained success and failure. 2) Decision consistency will be studied to estimate the degree and types of errors being made in the classification process. 3) Discriminant studies will be conducted in an attempt to validate, through the use of external factors, the AYP classification of schools as satisfactory or failing. 4) Studies of “growth” will be conducted to approximate the degree of sensitivity within the NCLB—AYP determination process.</p> <p>The state has for many years used a national technical advisory committee (TAC) to assist it with its testing programs. The TAC typically meets 3 times a year and in the past year and a half has dedicated 1/3 of its time specifically to school accountability issues. The state will continue these efforts using the TAC to plan refinements to its assessment and accountability system.</p> <p>Evidence: AYP Steps PPT and Pre-technical accountability bulletin</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?	<p>State has a plan to maintain continuity in AYP decisions necessary for validity through planned assessment changes, and other changes necessary to comply fully with NCLB.¹²</p> <p>State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.</p>	<p>State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP.</p> <p>State does not have a plan for handling changes: e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>As noted previously, the state anticipates three major shifts in the assessment profile being used in the AYP determination process. This will lead to a recalculation of the annual thresholds for achievement after the 2002-03 school year and again after the 2005-06 school year. These adjustments correspond respectively to the elimination of the NRT as an AYP indicator and the full implementation of the final assessment system. The recalculation of annual thresholds will not in any way change the 100% proficiency requirement for the 2013-2014 school year. It can, however, change the intermediate goals in years prior to the 2013-2014 school year.</p>		

¹² Several events may occur which necessitate such a plan. For example, (1) the State may need to include additional assessments in grades 3-8 by 2005-2006; (2) the State may revise content and/or academic achievement standards; (3) the State may need to recalculate the starting point with the addition of new assessments; or (4) the State may need to incorporate the graduation rate or other indicators into its State Accountability System. These events may require new calculations of validity and reliability.

PRINCIPLE 10. In order for a public school or LEA to make AYP, the State ensures that it assessed at least 95% of the students enrolled in each subgroup.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?</p>	<p>State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.</p>	<p>The state does not have a procedure for determining the rate of students participating in statewide assessments.</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are not held accountable for testing at least 95% of their students.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>For all state tests the state will employ a methodology whereby, for every student enrolled during the testing window, a test answer document must be submitted on the student's behalf. This is true for all students whether they actually test with or without accommodations, test in the state alternate or district modified assessment, refuse to participate, or are absent during the test window ^a.</p> <p>The score sheet methodology is being used in part because of student transience and the substantive difference in time between the state's official enrollment count date and the dates for testing. Although there is an official count day, unofficial counts are taken at least two times during the school year. Based on information stored on the state and local SIS systems and official count day records, auditing of submitted score sheets will take place. In those cases in which significant differences exist between count day information and submitted score sheets, schools/school districts will be required to provide formal explanations.</p> <p>Students are counted as having participated so long as they attempt to take the test. An attempt is defined as a returned score sheet which includes valid responses. For example, if a student's score sheet is invalidated by school personnel because of inappropriate student behavior, that student would not be counted as having participated.</p> <p>^a Student participation on the High School Proficiency Examination (HSPE) will be determined using first time administration participation rates for the 2002-03 school year only. Students are given their first opportunity to take the HSPE in April of their sophomore year. Therefore, participation rates will be calculated using the ratio of sophomores participating in the April HSPE administration divided by the enrollment number for tenth graders of that same year. This method is considered the most parsimonious and is not plagued by problems associated with attrition, second-time test takers, and/or population growth. Beginning in 2003-04 a more efficient process will be used that tracks a cohort from the fall of the 10th grade year through the April 11th grade administration. Tracking the cohort will allow for an accurate accounting of students that arrive new to the cohort between enrollment date in grade 10 and the 11th grade April administration. Moreover, it will allow students that first take the test after the 10th grade administration to be counted as having participated. It is anticipated that in 2003-04 school districts will be given an opportunity to "resolve" changes in the cohort population observed by the state. Beginning in 2004-05 it is expected that this process will be fully automated. At that time, extension through grade 12 will be considered.</p> <p>Evidence: Statute, SMART dictionary, Answer documents</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?	State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules.	State does not have a procedure for making this determination.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>For subpopulations within schools/school districts, or for schools/school districts as a whole, with fewer than 20 students, all students would be required to participate to meet the 95% NCLB participation threshold. The state recognizes that in practice there are extenuating circumstances that can arise preventing a student from participating.</p> <p>For these small schools/school districts and/or subpopulations, the state intends to calculate the participation rate but will allow a participation rate of “N” – 1 (N being the number of students in the group). For groups with 20 or more students, exact participation rate percentages will be compared against the 95% threshold.</p> <p>The state provides extended testing windows. The state encourages school districts and schools to use “make-up” test days within the windows to ensure that all students can participate.</p> <p>As required by the NCLB Act, the operational definition for determining participation rate will come into effect during the 2002-03 school year. Current Nevada statute and supporting regulation requires only a 90% participation rate. Participation rates have been a part of Nevada’s accountability system since the inception of the Nevada Education Reform Act (NERA) of 1997. NERA has depended solely upon the use of norm-referenced testing performance in grades 4, 8, and 10. Schools otherwise qualifying as “exemplary” had to test at least 95% of their eligible population of students, “high achieving” schools had to test at least 93% of their eligible students, and schools receiving a designation as “adequate” had to test at least 90% of their eligible students. Any school that tested less than 90% of their eligible students for two consecutive years was required to re-test their students at the expense of the district and under the supervision of NDE staff. By Nevada law, the only students not required to participate in testing were special education students whose IEPs exempted them from participation in large-scale assessments, and LEP students whose Language Assessment Scale (LAS) results were below designated levels of performance. Students exempt from testing under these two conditions have historically been removed from the formula in the calculation of the percentage of students tested. All other students within a school comprise the “eligible population of students”. Although Nevada law has allowed the exemptions described in this paragraph, training for the administration of the NRT testing for the fall of 2002 included strong recommendations for the testing of all students in order to comply with NCLB expectations. It is also important to note that no students have been removed from AYP calculations under NCLB. Although Nevada has not previously broken out participation rates by subject area, two years of historical data, collapsing participation rate across grade levels, under the NERA accountability system suggests that this NCLB requirement can be met at the state level:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Fall 2001 NRT: 96.7% participation rate Fall 2002 NRT: 97.2% participation rate</p> <p>Because of statutory inconsistencies, the state will use the 95% criterion outlined in the NCLB Act in making designations. The state will consider on appeal participation rate and student inclusion issues because of the inconsistency.</p> <p>Evidence: Test Calendar, Regulation</p>		

Accountability Plan Pre-technical Bulletin

Nevada Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Model and Method

To comply with the NCLB Act, a significant revision to the current school accountability models will need to occur. Currently, Nevada uses dual systems to make annual school accountability designations.

The first system, required by the Nevada Education Reform Act of 1997, is one that is applied to all schools in the state. School performance on a nationally referenced test (NRT), test participation rates, and average daily attendance are used to classify schools into one of four achievement levels (needing improvement, adequate, high achievement, exemplary).

The second system is applied to Title I served schools only. This system too relies heavily on NRT performance. A relative growth formula is used to classify schools as having made or having failed to make AYP. Essentially, a 5% or greater change in the number of proficient students is required to make AYP.

The emerging Nevada accountability system will blend these two systems into a single statewide accountability system. In short, all public schools and all students enrolled in public schools will be held accountable for meeting Nevada academic expectations. This is a significant divergence from the previous models in which exemptions based on disability and language proficiency status were allowed. Moreover, the current NERA system does not hold all schools to the same standard.

The following is an explication of the accountability process in Nevada as it relates to making annual AYP judgments for schools, school districts, and the state as a whole. Throughout this document reference is made to the school in discussing the AYP determination process. By and large, the same provision applies to the school district and state as a level of analysis. In those instances when a difference may exist based on the level of analysis, clarification will be made.

Definition of Achievement Levels

The central tenet of the NCLB Act is to move all students to proficiency within a 12 year period and, hence, eliminate long standing disparities in academic performance between various subpopulations. To address this central tenet, states must have clearly articulated academic expectations (content standards) and definitions of proficiency (achievement standards). Based on this foundation, assessments must be designed that cover the breadth and depth of the content standards and that yield results that can be interpreted using the achievement levels.

All schools are to be held accountable to performance relative to Nevada content and achievement standards. The content standards describe the breadth and depth of Nevada's academic expectations. The achievement standards refer to descriptions of performance expectations relative to the content standards. Nevada currently distinguishes among four levels of achievement. The highest level of achievement is "exceeds standard" followed by "meets standard", "approaches standard", and "below standard", respectively.

In developing its custom high school examinations, Nevada has aligned its assessments to the meets standard level (see CRT standard setting technical bulletin (2003 Harcourt Educational Measurement); HSPE standard setting technical bulletin (2002 CTB/McGraw-Hill). Additionally, for assessments in grades 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8, Nevada has aligned its assessments to all achievement levels. Nevada will undertake the process of developing aligned achievement levels, beyond the meets standard cut point, for the high school exit examinations by June 30th, 2003. Note that in aligning its assessments to the lowest level of achievement, the Department of Education replaced the achievement level label, "below standard" with "developing/emergent". The State Board of Education accepted this label change in the fall of the 2002-2003 school year.

Academic Assessments as Basis for AYP

At the heart of the accountability system is the use of aligned assessments. Although other factors are directly related to student academic achievement, state large-scale assessments are the primary indicators of continuous improvement. The NCLB Act requires annual assessments in English language arts and math administered in grades 3 through 8 and at least in one grade in the 9 through 12 grade span. These tests must be fully implemented by the 2005-2006 school year. There are requirements for science assessment; however, there is no requirement that science results be used when determining AYP.

Nevada currently administers criterion-referenced tests (CRTs) in grades 3 and 5 (reading and math; science at grade 5) and has been actively developing CRTs at grade 8 (reading, math, and science). Nevada also administers a direct writing assessment at grades 4 and 8 as well as norm-referenced tests (NRTs) at grades 4, 7, and 10 (reading, language, math, and science). At the high school level, Nevada administers high school proficiency examinations in reading, writing, and math. Nevada also administers an alternate assessment (SCAAN) for students with significant cognitive disabilities.

Nevada's final assessment system will not be implemented until the 2005-2006 school year. General specifications for the final assessment system are expected to emerge from the 2003 Legislative session ending not earlier than June 2nd, 2003. Currently and after full implementation, assessment in English language arts and math will be the primary AYP indicators. Nevada is in a transition period with its accountability measures. It anticipates two shifts in its assessment system. The first will occur in the 2003-04 school year as NRTs are phased out of the AYP determination process, and the second will

occur in 2005-06 when the full system is implemented. The following table displays by year those tests that will be used in determining AYP.

Tests Used in Determining AYP

Grade	2002-03	2003-04 & 2004-05	2005-06 +
3	CRT—R & M	CRT—R & M	CRT—R & M
4	NRT ^a —R, L, & M	Writing (analytic)	CRT—R & M Writing (analytic)
5	CRT—R & M	CRT—R & M	CRT—R & M
6			CRT—R & M
7	NRT ^a —R, L, & M		CRT—R & M
8	Writing (analytic)	Writing (analytic) CRT—R & M	Writing (analytic) CRT—R & M
High School	HSPE ^b —R, W, & M	HSPE ^b —R, W, & M	HSPE ^b —R, W, & M

CRT = Criterion-referenced test; NRT = Norm-referenced test; HSPE = High School Proficiency Exam
R = Reading; L = Language; W = Writing (holistic); M = Math

^a During the 2002-03 school year, a nationally norm-referenced test (the ITBS) is being used in the AYP determination process. This is being done for three reasons. First, until the state legislature (currently in session) formally removes the NRT as the primary indicator for school designation, the department does not have authority to ignore it. Second, current statute and the Title I transition plan for assessment under IASA provided achievement level definitions aligning NRT scores to state performance standards. Third, NCLB requires states to develop baseline estimates using data from the 2001-02 school year. As a result, the state of Nevada has had to rely heavily on NRT performance for these initial estimates. The state does not anticipate using NRT performance in the AYP determination process after the 2002-03 school year.

^b The state of Nevada has a long history of using high school examinations for student accountability. Students must pass a series of rigorous standards-based assessments in reading, writing, and math to earn a standard high school diploma. Assessments target 12th grade benchmarks. In administering “exit” examinations, Nevada adheres closely to the Standards for Educational and Psychological Measurement. This includes providing students with multiple opportunities to pass the individual tests. Although tied to 12th grade benchmarks, students are provided opportunities for reading and math tests beginning in grade 10 and the writing test in grade 11. There is no guarantee, however, that all students have had the opportunity to learn all prerequisite material until the spring of their 12th grade year. Nevada is opting to use the “exit” examinations to fulfill the NCLB school accountability requirements at the high school level. Nevada, based on USED review and recommendation, agrees to use cumulative pass rates up to and including the 11th grade April administration for a given graduating class. The numerator for the performance estimate would include the sum of those students having passed the examinations on each state administration leading up and including the April administration, and the denominator would include all students counted in the numerator and all students participating in the 11th grade April administration. (The number of students who drop out is controlled through the Graduation Rate other indicator.) Once Nevada can efficiently track students across administrations, extending the cohort analysis through grade 12 will be considered by USED.

Each of the elementary and middle school examinations is administered one time during the school year. Currently CRTs are administered in the spring, while the NRTs and the writing assessments are administered in the fall. The state department recommendation is that all assessments contributing to AYP decisions be administered during the spring of the school year. Moreover, all contributing assessments yield proficiency information aligned to Nevada's achievement standards.

As noted above, the state of Nevada has a long history of using high school examinations for student accountability. In administering these "exit" examinations, Nevada adheres to the Standards for Educational and Psychological Measurement.¹³ Students are not expected to demonstrate proficiency on these examinations until the spring of their 12th grade year. Listed below is a general administration schedule for the reading and math high school tests. Students get a first opportunity to take the writing test in February of their 11th grade year and have no April and no summer opportunity in grade 11.

High School Proficiency Testing Calendar

	November	February	April	Summer
10th Grade			X	
11th Grade			X	X
12th Grade	X	X	X	

Aggregating Data to Calculate AYP

AYP is a school level, district level, and state level issue and designations apply to the whole school, school district, and state. Using the school as an example, multiple tests administered within and at different grade levels constitute different data points that provide information regarding school performance. This information can be combined to produce reliable information with respect to school performance leading to valid school accountability decisions.

Throughout much of this bulletin, a running school example will be used to exemplify the various steps associated with the AYP determination process. A fictitious school, Bush Elementary, which serves students in grades K-5, will be used for illustrative purposes. All presented information is hypothetical. Moreover, it is assumed that the determination of the percentage of proficient students is based on students that have been enrolled in the school (or school district) for a full academic year.¹⁴

To increase the reliability of the information, assessment results will be aggregated using a weighted average in three separate stages (all stages do not necessarily apply to all

¹³ Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (1999). Joint publication from American Education Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. Washington, D.C.: AERA

¹⁴ Assuming a spring test administration, a student is considered to be enrolled for a full academic year if he or she was enrolled at the school on the state's official enrollment count day and remains continuously enrolled at the same school through and including the assessment window. Note that all students, regardless of time in school are required to participate in testing, and results for all students are reported.

schools). First, for grades within which multiple tests are administered within the same subject area domain (i.e. English Language Arts—reading, language, & writing), performance data will be combined. Second, performance data within a subject area domain will be combined across grades (i.e. grades 3 through 5). Third, for very small schools, performance data within a subject domain can be combined across school years (i.e. 2001-02 plus 2002-03).

The basic NCLB unit of measurement to be used in the AYP determination process is the percentage of students at or above the proficiency cut scores (PAC). However, student proficiency is measured in several ways (i.e. reading, language, writing). Although student proficiency is reported for each specific test, when making AYP decisions this information is collapsed across tests¹⁵. When combining information within a grade, a weighted PAC is determined by summing the number of proficient students by test, dividing that term by the sum of the total number of students taking each test, and dividing that by the number of tests taken. A similar combination is used to approximate performance at the approaching and exceeds achievement levels.

To exemplify the process of combining data from multiple tests within a grade, at Bush Elementary 65 out of 100 4th grade students scored at or above the meets standard level in reading. Additionally, 55 out of 100 4th grade students passed the writing test. To derive the PAC at grade 4 in English language arts (ELA) proficiency, we make the following calculation:

$$\frac{65 + 55}{100 + 100} \div 2 = \frac{120}{200} \div 2 \text{ or } \frac{60}{100} \text{ or PAC} = 60\%$$

Using this process, through the combination of performance on multiple tests, we have determined that 60 out of 100 students in grade 4 are proficient.

This derived grade level information would now need to be combined across grade to represent the school more fully. We follow the same basic process. Let us assume that Bush elementary enrolls 100 students in grade 3 and 100 students in grade 5. Let us assume that 45 students in grade 3 met the standard on the reading test and that 65 students in grade 5 met the standard in reading. To derive the school level ELA PAC, we would perform the following calculation:

$$(\text{grade 3 PAC}) + (\text{grade 4 PAC}) + (\text{grade 5 PAC}) \text{ or}$$

¹⁵ The state has opted not to set specific achievement levels for ELA for the following reason. Tests measuring the state standards must align to both content and achievement standards. Nevada has two separate tests that align to different portions of the ELA standards including both reading and writing. As required, achievement levels will be established for each of these tests. The two types of tests are scaled very differently. The aggregation of information from both tests is solely for purpose of making AYP determinations. There is no intention to combine the two scales and derive a single test score.

$$\frac{45 + 60 + 65}{100 + 100 + 100} = \frac{170}{300} \quad \text{or PAC} = 56.7\%$$

In this stage, there is no need to control the number of students by the number of separate tests taken. A second way to display this information is provided below.

	Number of Students	Number of Students Meeting Standard
Grade 3	100	45
Grade 4	100	60
Grade 5	100	65
Combined	300	170
The overall PAC is equal to 170/300 or 56.7%		

The Nevada plan submitted to the USED on April 30th, 2003 indicated that the state would be collapsing across years of assessment in addition to the above noted aggregation steps. This will only occur for schools with very small populations of students (schools with fewer than 25 students cumulatively enrolled in those grades in which the state mandates testing). Like the other methods of aggregation, this is intended to increase the stability of the annual judgments. In those instances in which this step is appropriate, the same process for combining performance data across grades is followed.

Calculating Starting Points

The overarching NCLB goal is that all students must be proficient in both ELA and math. NCLB provides 12 years following the 2001-02 school year to accomplish this task. After a state determines its definition of proficiency, it must develop a baseline of performance so that it can effectively plan for achieving the 12-year expectation for all students.

NCLB provides states two methods to calculate AYP baselines or starting points. The one caveat is that the state must use the method that results in the higher estimate of proficiency. NCLB further requires that starting points be established separately for English language arts and mathematics.

The first method is termed the school percentile method. With this method, schools are placed in rank order ranging from the school with the lowest percentage of proficient students to the school with the highest percentage of proficient students. The total enrollment for each school is also indicated. Starting with the school with the lowest level of proficiency, enrollment across schools is summed. The proficiency rate for the school falling along the continuum of enrollment up to and including the 20th percentile of the total state population is used to define the statewide starting point or AYP baseline.

The second method is termed the subpopulation method. With this method, at the state level, the percentage of students at or above proficiency is disaggregated by the major race/ethnicity groups, IEP status, LEP status, and by economically disadvantaged

students. The subpopulation with the lowest level of proficiency would be used to establish the statewide starting point or AYP baseline.

In Nevada, separate starting points have been established by subject area (English language arts & math) for elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools. At all levels, both methods were explored with the school percentile method resulting in the higher estimate of proficiency.

At the elementary level, performance on state tests administered at grades 3, 4, and 5, in the 2001-02 school year were used to calculate the starting points. At the middle school level, tests administered at grade 8 in the 2001-02 school year were used. To establish the school level proficiency estimates, grade level performance was combined following the aggregation rules listed above. Appendix 1 displays the rank order of schools by proficiency estimates, the school enrollment figures, and the school whose enrollment fell at the 20th percentile of the total state population.

For the high school grade span, cumulative performance data based on all available administrations for the 2003 student cohort were used.

Statewide Starting Points or AYP Baselines by Grade Level and Subject

	Elementary	Middle	High School
English Language Arts	32.4%	37.0%	91.0%
Mathematics	37.3%	38.0%	58.0%

Calculating Annual Measurable Objectives and Intermediate Goals

NCLB requires that states, using starting points and the 100% proficiency requirement, establish annual measurable objectives or performance thresholds. NCLB allows states to establish incremental increases or intermediate goals in developing the performance trajectory as long as both the incremental increases in the state PAC goal are equidistant and that 100% of students are expected to be proficient in the 2013-14 school year. The first incremental increase must occur no later than during the 2004-05 school year, and subsequent increments must occur after no more than three years.

Nevada has established a trajectory of annual goals that requires equidistant incremental increases occurring at different time intervals. As allowed by NCLB, the first incremental increase occurs during the 2004-05 school year. The second increase occurs in 2007-08, followed by an increase in 2009-10, an increase in 2011-12, an increase in 2012-13, and the final increase in 2013-14. Table 2 displays the incremental increases by school year and by subject.

Incremental Statewide Proficiency Targets by Subject, Grade Level, and Year

	Elementary School		Middle School		High School	
	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math
Baseline	32.4%	37.3%	37.0%	38.0%	91.0%	58.0%
2002-03	32.4%	37.3%	37.0%	38.0%	91.0%	58.0%

2003-04	32.4%	37.3%	37.0%	38.0%	91.0%	58.0%
2004-05	43.7%	47.7%	47.5%	48.3%	92.5%	65.0%
2005-06	43.7%	47.7%	47.5%	48.3%	92.5%	65.0%
2006-07	43.7%	47.7%	47.5%	48.3%	92.5%	65.0%
2007-08	55.0%	58.1%	58.0%	58.6%	94.0%	72.0%
2008-09	55.0%	58.1%	58.0%	58.6%	94.0%	72.0%
2009-10	66.3%	68.5%	68.5%	68.9%	95.5%	79.0%
2010-11	66.3%	68.5%	68.5%	68.9%	95.5%	79.0%
2011-12	77.6%	78.9%	79.0%	79.2%	97.0%	86.0%
2012-13	88.9%	89.3%	89.5%	89.5%	98.5%	93.0%
2013-14	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Although Nevada has had a school accountability and designation process since 1997, the philosophy of the system was different than the apparent NCLB philosophy. Although held accountable to the public, schools with very low levels of performance were provided assistance to make progress. Relative to NCLB, the stakes associated with continuous failure are much lower in the current Nevada system. Moreover, the NERA assistance model requires that the state identify a manageable number of schools so that it could effectively serve them, and, hence, the model is quite liberal. NCLB is a much more restrictive model.

The change in the accountability system and the underlying philosophy requires that the state build capacity to meet the NCLB prescription that “the state will use a single statewide accountability system designed to ensure the success of all students.” By tiering the incremental “status” thresholds in the way illustrated above, Nevada will minimize the number of schools identified in the short term allowing a better opportunity to build state department capacity to meet the needs of schools and school districts.

The philosophical change underlying the system prompts change at the state, school district and school level. It is clear that all schools will be challenged by the new system and that, to be successful, capacity must be built at the local level.

Other AYP Indicators

In determining AYP, several indicators are used. The primary indicators are assessment related and involve the aforementioned PAC score, or percentage of students above the proficiency cut score. The PAC is used in two ways. It is compared annually against a statewide PAC goal, and it is compared against the previous year PAC to determine the reduction in non-proficient students. A more thorough description of these processes is outlined later in this bulletin. In addition to the PAC, other indicators are required in determining AYP.

Other Indicators

Graduation Rate→ At the high school level, school, school district, and state AYP determinations will be based in part on graduation rate. Using an adaptation of a formula

developed by the National Center for Education Statistics, graduation rate is based on a consideration of students who complete high school with or without having earned a diploma and students who have dropped out of school at each high school grade (9-12). The formula for calculating graduation rate is presented below.

The numerator of the formula includes only diploma recipients. In Nevada, this includes students who earn a standard high school diploma, an advanced high school diploma, or an adjusted high school diploma. For the purposes of school designations under NCLB, adjusted diploma recipients are removed from the numerator. This does not include students who earn a certificate of attendance. The denominator includes all diploma recipients, certificate of attendance recipients, dropouts (9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th) and GED recipients.

For the 2001-2002 school year, graduation rate is equal to¹⁶:

$$\frac{\text{\# of diploma recipients in 2001-2002 (excluding adjusted diploma recipients)}}{\text{\# of all diploma recipients (2001-02) + \# of certificates of attendance (2001-02) + GED recipients (2001-02) + 9th grade dropouts (1998-99) + 10th grade dropouts (1999-00) + 11th grade dropouts (2000-01) + 12th grade dropouts (2001-02)}}.$$

Although the state collects and reports completion rates on an annual basis, graduation rate has not been used as a school accountability indicator previously. Moreover, to date information pertinent for establishing graduation rate has not been collected for all subpopulations. It appears that graduation rate can be disaggregated for all subpopulations with the exception of economically disadvantaged, LEP, and IEP students. The full complement of disaggregated data should be available in the 2005-2006 school year. Until that time, Nevada plans to use average daily attendance for the missing subpopulations.

It is also the case that graduation rate for a school year is established several months after the completion of the school year. This means that for the 2002-2003 AYP designations, graduation rates from the 2001-2002 school year will be considered.

After complete information is available for the 2001-2002 school year, the state will establish a graduation rate baseline and subsequent threshold targets. The State Board of Education is expected to establish graduation rate thresholds in regulation in summer 2003. For purposes of AYP comparisons, schools will have to demonstrate that they have met the annual threshold or improved toward the threshold in comparison to the previous school year.

¹⁶ Based on formal discussions with the United States Department of Education, Nevada has agreed to revise the formula in two ways. First, IEP students who earn an adjusted diploma will not be recognized, through this formula as having earned a standard diploma. Second, IEP students, if consistent with their IEP, will be given 7 years to earn the standard diploma, as opposed to the 4 years provided to all other students. Third, GED recipients will be added to the denominator of the formula.

Average Daily Attendance→ For elementary and middle schools, average daily attendance will be used as an AYP indicator. Daily attendance is logged through school district local student information systems and the SMART system. Based on this information, average daily attendance rate by various subpopulations will be calculated.

Average daily attendance will then be compared against the statewide target for attendance. If the school, school district, or subpopulation within the school/school district attends at or above the state goal or improves their rate of attendance in comparison to the previous school year, they will be judged as having met the criterion.

Statewide targets for attendance rate will be established by the State Board of Education in the summer of 2003. Current Nevada statute (NRS 385.365) requires an average daily attendance rate of at least 90%. The State Board will consider this rate and other alternatives.

Participation Rate→ In addition to performance on state tests and performance relative to the other academic indicators, the percentage of students taking the state tests is considered in making AYP determinations. In short, a minimum participation rate of 95% is required for all eligible students.

The state requires that for every student enrolled during a testing window, a test answer document be submitted to the test vendor on the student's behalf. This is true for all students whether they actually participate with or without accommodation, participate in a state alternate assessment, refuse to participate, or are absent during the test window.

Participation rate is calculated by dividing the number of score sheets with valid student performance by the total number of submitted score sheets. For school, school districts and subpopulations with 20 or more students, this results in an "exact" calculation of participation rate.

For schools, school districts and subpopulations within schools/school districts with fewer than 20 students, all students would have to participate to meet the 95% participation requirement. The state recognizes that in practice there are extenuating circumstances that can arise preventing a student from participating.

For small schools/school districts and/or subpopulations, the state intends to calculate the participation rate but will allow a participation rate of $N - 1$ (N being the number of students in the group). In practice, this means that for a school with 15 enrolled students, 14 students would have to participate. Likewise, for a school with 5 students enrolled, a minimum of 4 students would have to participate.

The answer document methodology is being used in part because of student transience and the substantive difference in time between the state's official enrollment count date and the dates for testing. Although there is an official count day, unofficial counts are taken at least two other times during the school year. Based on information stored on the

state and local SIS systems and official count day records, the state will audit a sample (approximately 10%) of submitted answer documents, comparing them to the various enrollment counts. In those cases in which significant differences exist between count day information and submitted score sheets, schools/school districts will be required to provide formal explanations for the discrepancies.

Minimum Group Size

While emphasizing the need to close the achievement gap, NCLB recognizes that accountability decisions must be reliable and valid. The diversity of student populations and the heterogeneity of school size make it difficult to make reliable and valid decisions for all NCLB identified subpopulations. To address the issue, NCLB requires that states ensure reliability and as part of that process explain how group size differences will be dealt with.

Reporting

For reporting purposes, the state sets the minimum at 10 students. This is consistent with current state policy. Although policy has supported an “n” count of 10 students, state regulation sets a lower limit of 5 students. Regulations will be revised to reflect a reporting “n” of 10 during the summer of 2003.

The minimum reporting “n” ($n = 10$) in almost all instances protects the privacy of individual students. However, regulation will be established masking the release of scores for any size subpopulation if all students score within the same achievement level. Regulation supporting this reporting contingency will be passed in the summer of 2003.

AYP Comparisons

When making statistical comparisons for the purpose of AYP judgments, a group of 25 or more students will be required. This is true for both status or threshold comparisons and relative growth comparisons. For groups of 25 or more students, statistical methodology will be used to buttress the reliability of our judgments. Where appropriate, confidence intervals and statistical tests will be used. Statistical comparisons will be one-tailed comparisons to determine if the upper-boundary of observed performance meets or exceeds the predetermined status threshold or relative growth requirement.

Any given observation of performance may be biased for a variety of reasons. Although we assume that a given observation reflects “true” performance or ability, we know that a variety of factors independent of ability may influence performance. For example, one primary source of bias or error is differences or random fluctuations in the sample of participants from which the observation is collected. Understanding this, we accept that a given observation reflects a range of performance encompassing “true” performance.

In general, the null hypothesis driving AYP comparisons is that the school has met the status (or relative growth) target. The one tailed statistical comparisons are designed to

control against negative classifications or help to ensure that schools who have in fact met the target are not misclassified as failing to meet the target (false negative).¹⁷ For status comparisons, the controlled error rate will be set at .95. This ensures that the confidence for individual comparisons is high (greater or equal to .95). For relative growth comparisons, the controlled error rate will be set at .75.

Status→ To calculate the upper boundary of the 95% confidence interval for status comparisons, the following formula for the standard error of the proportion is used.

$$\sigma_P = \sqrt{PQ / N}$$

Where P = the proportion of proficient students, Q = 1-P, and N = the total number of students. The standard error is then multiplied by a Z-score (i.e. 1.645) to calculate the one-tailed confidence interval upper boundary.

For example, in 2001-02 Bush Elementary had 550 students and an ELA PAC of 53.1 (i.e. 53.1% of the students were proficient in English language arts). To calculate the standard error of the proportion for Bush Elementary, we multiply 53.1 by 46.9, divide that by 550, and then take the square root of that term (sqrt of ((53.1*46.9)/550) = 2.13). The standard error is then multiplied by 1.645 to determine the one-tailed 95% confidence upper limit (2.13*1.645 = 3.5). Turning back to the theoretical rationale offered above, based on the “raw” observation that 53.1% of the students at Bush Elementary are proficient, we have a high degree of confidence (95%) that the “true” level of proficiency at Bush Elementary does not exceed 56.6% (observed performance + statistical adjustment based on the sampling error estimate).

In comparing the PAC for Bush Elementary against the statewide target (i.e. status comparison), we take the observed PAC and add to it the statistical adjustment (53.1 + 3.5 = 56.6). If 56.6 is less than the statewide target, we can reliably classify the school as having failed to meet the AYP status criterion.

Relative growth→ For the relative growth comparisons, the same general procedure is followed. However, because the comparison involves investigation of the reduction of non-proficient students from the previous school year or, stated differently, the difference in proficient students, an alternative estimate of error is more appropriately used. In this instance, we use the standard error of the difference in proportions. The same general rationale described above governing the use of the standard error prescribes the use of

¹⁷ For fuller discussions of validity, reliability and AYP, see Baker, E.L. & Linn, R.L. (2002) Validity issues for accountability systems (CRESST—CSE Technical Report 585), Linn, R.L., Baker, E.L., & Herman, J.L. (2002) Minimum Group Size for Measuring Adequate Yearly Progress (Fall 2002—The CRESST Line); Hill, R.K. (2001) Issues related to the reliability of school accountability scores (nciea.org), Hill, R.K. (2002) Impact of minimum subgroup size on the validity and reliability of NCLB decisions (nciea.org), Hill, R.K. & DePascale, C.A. (2003) Reliability of No Child Left Behind Accountability Designs (In press); Council of Chief State School Officers (2002) Making Valid and Reliable Decisions in Determining Adequate Yearly Progress

this alternative formula. Because we are now considering two observations as opposed to one, we must be able to account for measurement error associated with each observation.

The standard error of the difference in proportions is calculated using the following formula.

$$\sigma_{P1-P2} = \sqrt{\sigma_{P1}^2 + \sigma_{P2}^2}$$

Where P1 is the first observation (year 1 score) and P2 is the second observation (year 2 score).

Note: NCLB gives primacy to the status comparison. Safe harbor or relative growth is an alternative path and is only used if status has been failed. Because of its secondary status and the greater sensitivity difference scores have with respect to sampling error and other error sources, there is less need to control against false negative classifications. Because of this, a controlled error rate of .75 is used.

Using the Bush Elementary example, we know the following: In year 1, Bush Elementary enrolled 550 students and had an ELA PAC of 53.1%. In year 2, Bush Elementary enrolled 580 students and had an ELA PAC of 58%. If we subtract 53.1 from 58, we observe that there was a reduction of 4.9% of non-proficient students.

To calculate the standard error of this difference, we take the square root of $((53.1 * 46.9) / 550) + ((58 * 42) / 580)$. This equals the square root of $(4.53 + 4.2)$, or 2.95. We then must adjust the error rate by the appropriate z-score or .68. We take 2.95 and multiply it by .68 and find an upper limit of 2.006.

Consequently, by taking into consideration sampling error from both points of observation, we accept that based on the observed reduction of 4.9%, the “true” reduction (given the single standard error adjustment) could be as high as $4.9 + 2.006$, or 6.91%.

The NCLB Act requires a reduction of at least 10% to meet the relative growth or “safe harbor” criterion. In this instance, after the statistical adjustment, we find that the reduction is below the 10% threshold, and, as a result, we can say with confidence that the AYP relative growth criterion has not been met.

Note that specific examples are being provided, but this process of adjusting observed scores must be done for all identifiable subpopulations and for ELA and math separately (2 subjects X 9 subpopulations X Status and Relative Growth). The production and use of “look-up” tables, as illustrated below, will aid in the transparency and calculation of these comparisons.

For status comparisons, the table includes the 95% correction based on the standard error of the proportion that would have to be added to the observed PAC. For relative growth, the table includes the minimum observed difference necessary to meet the 10% criterion.

Look-Up Table for Standard Error of the Proportion Adjustment: 95% One-Tailed Confidence Limit (Status)

N Count	Percentage Above Cut																		
	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95
25	4.36	6.00	7.14	8.00	8.66	9.17	9.54	9.80	9.95	10.00	9.95	9.80	9.54	9.17	8.66	8.00	7.14	6.00	4.36
30	3.98	5.48	6.52	7.30	7.91	8.37	8.71	8.94	9.08	9.13	9.08	8.94	8.71	8.37	7.91	7.30	6.52	5.48	3.98
35	3.68	5.07	6.04	6.76	7.32	7.75	8.06	8.28	8.41	8.45	8.41	8.28	8.06	7.75	7.32	6.76	6.04	5.07	3.68
40	3.45	4.74	5.65	6.32	6.85	7.25	7.54	7.75	7.87	7.91	7.87	7.75	7.54	7.25	6.85	6.32	5.65	4.74	3.45
45	3.25	4.47	5.32	5.96	6.45	6.83	7.11	7.30	7.42	7.45	7.42	7.30	7.11	6.83	6.45	5.96	5.32	4.47	3.25
50	3.08	4.24	5.05	5.66	6.12	6.48	6.75	6.93	7.04	7.07	7.04	6.93	6.75	6.48	6.12	5.66	5.05	4.24	3.08
55	2.94	4.05	4.81	5.39	5.84	6.18	6.43	6.61	6.71	6.74	6.71	6.61	6.43	6.18	5.84	5.39	4.81	4.05	2.94
60	2.81	3.87	4.61	5.16	5.59	5.92	6.16	6.32	6.42	6.45	6.42	6.32	6.16	5.92	5.59	5.16	4.61	3.87	2.81
65	2.70	3.72	4.43	4.96	5.37	5.68	5.92	6.08	6.17	6.20	6.17	6.08	5.92	5.68	5.37	4.96	4.43	3.72	2.70
70	2.60	3.59	4.27	4.78	5.18	5.48	5.70	5.86	5.95	5.98	5.95	5.86	5.70	5.48	5.18	4.78	4.27	3.59	2.60
75	2.52	3.46	4.12	4.62	5.00	5.29	5.51	5.66	5.74	5.77	5.74	5.66	5.51	5.29	5.00	4.62	4.12	3.46	2.52
80	2.44	3.35	3.99	4.47	4.84	5.12	5.33	5.48	5.56	5.59	5.56	5.48	5.33	5.12	4.84	4.47	3.99	3.35	2.44
85	2.36	3.25	3.87	4.34	4.70	4.97	5.17	5.31	5.40	5.42	5.40	5.31	5.17	4.97	4.70	4.34	3.87	3.25	2.36
90	2.30	3.16	3.76	4.22	4.56	4.83	5.03	5.16	5.24	5.27	5.24	5.16	5.03	4.83	4.56	4.22	3.76	3.16	2.30
95	2.24	3.08	3.66	4.10	4.44	4.70	4.89	5.03	5.10	5.13	5.10	5.03	4.89	4.70	4.44	4.10	3.66	3.08	2.24
100	2.18	3.00	3.57	4.00	4.33	4.58	4.77	4.90	4.97	5.00	4.97	4.90	4.77	4.58	4.33	4.00	3.57	3.00	2.18

Look-Up Table for the Difference in Proportions: .75 One-Tailed Confidence Limit (Relative Growth)

N Count Year 1	N Count Year 2	Year 1 percentage above cut																		
		5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95
25	25	6% ^a																		
25	30																			
25	35																			
30	30																			
30	35																			
30	40																			
35	35																			
35	40																			
35	45																			
40	40																			
40	45																			
40	50																			
45	45																			
45	50																			
45	55																			
50	50																			
50	55																			
50	60																			
55	55																			
55	60																			
55	65																			
60	60																			
60	65																			
60	70																			
65	65																			

65	70																		
65	75																		
70	70																		
70	75																		
70	80																		
75	75																		
75	80																		
75	85																		
80	80																		
80	85																		
80	90																		
85	85																		
85	90																		
85	95																		
90	90																		
90	95																		
90	100																		
95	95																		
95	100																		
100	100																		

^a with an N-count of 25 in each school year and a year 1 PAC of 5%, the minimum year 2 PAC would have to be 6%.

For schools with fewer than 25 students, performance data will be collapsed across school years for up to a three year period. Until enough performance data is available, additional criteria will be considered in making annual school profiles. Additional criteria include inspection of curriculum to evaluate alignment and opportunity/access for all students, a combination of state and local assessment data, school climate and safety, and information pertaining to teacher quality. The selection of additional information is predicated on choosing factors that can inform the school improvement process, regardless of large-scale assessment results.

The statistical approach in combination with a minimum “n” arguably offers the best strategy to make reliable AYP comparisons (that can be clearly understood) for the most schools and the most subpopulations. It is a compromise position. The use of confidence intervals and statistical tests does not require the establishment of a minimum n. As noted above, establishing a minimum n is arbitrary. However, the communication benefit gained by establishing the minimum n prompts its use. It does require a strong cautionary note for school districts. The minimum n will result in the elimination of many comparisons for subpopulations within schools and at times for entire schools. At the school district level, information from all schools is combined. Hence, the minimum n may have eliminated comparisons at the school level but the school district is still responsible for the performance of all students. If all students in the school are not attended to, the district is at increased risk of failure.

The Mechanics of Determining AYP

As noted previously, when making annual adequate yearly progress judgments, several indicators must be considered with primary emphasis being placed on student performance on the state required assessments in English language arts and mathematics.

The percentage of proficient students (PAC) is the primary AYP indicator. It is used in two general ways. First, an annual PAC is compared against the statewide goal for that given year. Second, an annual PAC is compared against the PAC from the previous school year to explore the change in the number of non-proficient students. Additionally, student participation rate on the state tests is an AYP indicator, as well as attendance rate in elementary and middle schools and graduation rate for high schools.

As a reminder, when making AYP determinations, the school or school district as a whole is considered as well as subpopulations within the school/school district to include where applicable major race/ethnicity groups (American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Black, White), students with disabilities (IEP), students with limited English proficiency (LEP), and students who are economically disadvantaged (Low SES).

Moreover, for any given school, as many as 63 separate comparisons may be required. Because of the inherent problems in conducting so many dependent comparisons, a two stage process has been developed. The first stage considers test participation rate, test performance and other indicator performance. The second stage uses the information from the previous stage to make final AYP determinations and school improvement classifications.

Note that failure with respect to any of the following steps can result in AYP failure. By contrast, a minimum of 37 comparisons must be made before making a satisfactory AYP judgment. Regardless of AYP outcome, annually a full AYP profile based on consideration of every step should be developed so that strengths and weaknesses can be documented continuously. This allows for data driven targeting of both human and financial resources.

AYP Steps

In making AYP determinations, two stages and several steps must be carried out. The sequence below uses the school as a unit to exemplify the process. The same sequence of steps applies when making school district judgments.

Stage 1

In stage 1, several steps occur in which participation rate, status performance, relative growth performance, and other indicator performance are considered. Based on the outcomes of these comparisons, a school profile containing a set of pluses and minuses is constructed. The completed school profile is used in stage 2 to make annual AYP determinations.

Step 1 → Participation Rate

First, student participation rate must be considered. The participation rates of the school as a whole and each identifiable subpopulation of students are compared to the 95% participation standard. Participation rate must be calculated separately for English language arts and mathematics.

As noted previously, participation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students participating on an examination by total school enrollment. Note that for participation rate, length of enrollment is irrelevant. All students enrolled during the test window are expected to take the state required assessments. Moreover, exact participation rates are calculated for any school or subpopulation within the school enrolling at least 20 students. When fewer than 20 students are enrolled in the whole school or within a subpopulation, the number participating is compared to the $n - 1$ standard, where n is equal to the number of enrolled students. See the following table for an example of calculating participation rate.

Participation Rates at Bush Elementary

	Enrollment	ELA Participants	ELA Rate	Math Participants	Math Rate
School	550	547	99.4	547	99.4
Amer Ind	7	7	Okay	7	Okay
Asian	39	39	100	39	100
Hispanic	184	183	99.5	183	99.5

Black	108	107	99.1	107	99.1
White	211	210	99.5	210	99.5
IEP	37	37	100	37	100
LEP	61	61	100	61	100
Low SES	215	215	100	215	100

For Bush Elementary, we find that the participation rate criterion for each subpopulation and for each subject was met (equal to or greater than 95%). Note that for American Indians, only 7 students were enrolled. As stated previously, for this small population, they are held to the $n - 1$ criterion ($7 - 1 = 6$) as opposed to the 95% criterion. Moreover, for Bush Elementary the participation rates are identical for each subject (ELA and Math). In practice, differences in participation rate by subject are likely to occur. For example, students may be absent on days in which the math test is offered but present when the English language arts tests are offered. By example, Bush Elementary has successfully made it through stage 1 of the AYP determination.

Emerging School Profile (Step 1)

	WS	AI	Asian	Hisp	Blk	Wht	IEP	LEP	L SES
ELA Rate	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
MATH Rate	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
ELA Perf									
MATH Perf									
OI Perf									

Step 2 → Status Comparisons

The status comparison is a comparison between the observed achievement levels of students in a given school year against the predetermined state performance goals. For specific comparisons, the formulas provided earlier in this document should be followed.

For the step 1 comparison, for a given school year and for the school as a whole, the number of students at or above the meets standard cut score is divided by the number of students enrolled in the school in those grades where the state requires testing.

This calculation results in a PAC score. The standard error of the proportion is calculated and multiplied by the appropriate z-score to establish the one-tailed confidence limit. The confidence limit is added to the observed proportion. The adjusted observed annual performance is then compared to the annual objective.

If the observed score is equal to or greater than the annual objective, the status requirement has been met and the school receives a plus (+). If it is less than the annual objective, the status

requirement has not been met and step 2 comparisons must be made to judge AYP. This process must be repeated for each identifiable subpopulation and for each subject area.

Bush Elementary Example for English Language Arts (Whole School)

Each Elementary Example for English Language Arts (Whole School)					
	Enrollment	Developing	Approaching	Meets	Exceeds
# of students	550	67	191	180	112
Sum of at or above meets	180 + 112 = 292				
Calculate PAC	292/550 = 53.1%				
Calculate one-tailed 95% CI	(Sqrt (53.1 * 46.9)/550)) * 1.645 = 3.5				
Calculate adjusted proportion (observed + CI)	53.1 + 3.5 = 56.6				

The table illustrates the steps taken from observed raw performance to calculation of the upper limit of the observed score (i.e. 56.6). It is this score that is then compared against the statewide goal. If that score is at or above the statewide goal, the school as a whole has met the criterion. For the sake of example, let's assume the school as a whole has met the criterion. This would result in a plus (+) indication in the school profile table.

This step would now need to be repeated for each subpopulation. The following table takes the reader through a status comparison for the LEP subpopulation in English language arts.

Bush Elementary Example for English Language Arts (LEP)

Basic Elementary Example for English Language Arts (ELA)					
	Enrollment	Developing	Approaching	Meets	Exceeds
# of students	61	15	30	16	
Sum of at or above meets	$16 + 0 = 16$				
Calculate PAC	$16/61 = 26.2\%$				
Calculate one-tailed 95% CI	$(\text{Sqrt}(26.2 * 73.8/61)) * 1.645 = 9.26$				
Calculate adjusted proportion (observed + CI)	$26.2 + 9.26 = 35.46$				

Let us assume that the PAC earned for LEP students is below the state target. Without moving through other examples, the emerging school profile has been adjusted based on a set of hypothetical Stage 2 status comparisons.

Emerging School Profile (Step 2)

	WS	AI	Asian	Hisp	Blk	Wht	IEP	LEP	L SES
ELA Rate	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
MATH Rate	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

NEVADA—CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

ELA Perf	+	+	+		+	+	+		+
MATH Perf		+	+	+	+	+		+	
OI Perf									

The profile is at this point incomplete. It cannot be completed until after step 3 and step 4 comparisons have been made. At this point, the table does illustrate that the status comparison was not made for Hispanic and LEP students in English language arts, and not for the whole school, IEP and Low SES students in math. Therefore, for these subpopulations, step 3 comparisons are required.

Step 3 → Relative Growth Comparisons (Safe Harbor)

“Relative growth” is the label chosen by Nevada to represent the Safe Harbor comparisons. The NCLB Act calls for a 10% reduction in the number of non-proficient students and the Nevada system holds true to that requirement.

Relative growth comparisons, like status comparisons, are based on the PAC. For the school as a whole, the PAC for the current year is compared to the PAC from the previous year. The goal for the current year comparison is a 10% reduction in the percentage of non-proficient students. For the running example, please assume that the year 2 ELA PAC for LEP students is equal to 31.2% and that 55 LEP students were enrolled.

As previously indicated, the objective is a 10% reduction in the percent of non-proficient students. Now that an objective is defined, the PAC from year one is subtracted from the current year PAC (year 2). Using the standard error of the difference formula, the standard error is calculated to establish the upper limit of the confidence interval.

Standard Error of the Difference Calculation (LEP)

Year 2 PAC minus Year 1	$31.2 - 26.2 = 5.0$		
Calculate one-tailed SEM .75 CI adjustment	$\text{Sqrt}((26.2 * 73.8)/61) + ((31.2 * 68.8)/55) = 8.41$ $8.41 * .68 = 5.72$		
Calculate adjusted difference score	$5.0 + 5.72 = 10.72\%$		

The adjusted difference score is then compared against the current year objective (10.0%). If a positive change was observed and the adjusted difference score is at or above the objective, the

school has met the relative growth criterion and receives a + in the profile. If the school fails the relative growth comparison, a minus appears in the profile.

If an identifiable subpopulation earns a + in a subject area based upon a relative growth comparison, a step 4 comparison must be made.¹⁸ The step 3 comparisons must be repeated for each identifiable subpopulation where applicable.

Emerging School Profile (Step 3)

	WS	AI	Asian	Hisp	Blk	Wht	IEP	LEP	L SES
ELA Rate	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
MATH Rate	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
ELA Perf	+	+	+	+(RG)	+	+	+	+(RG)	+
MATH Perf	+(RG)	+	+	+	+	+	+(RG)	+	+(RG)
OI Perf									

The summary table now shows that for each subject area and for each subpopulation, either the status or relative growth targets have been met. Note that when a performance + is earned based on relative growth, an (RG) is added to the + to indicate the need for a step 4 comparison. The profile cannot be completed until step 4 has been taken.

Step 4→ Other Indicator Comparisons

As noted, step 4 must be calculated for the school as a whole, regardless of step 2 performance. For each subpopulation in which step 2 was failed but step 3 was passed, there must be a comparison made of progress relative to the other indicator. As stated previously, the other indicator in elementary and middle school grades is average daily attendance.

For the other indicator comparison, the attendance rate in the most recent school year is considered in two ways. If the rate is at or above the average attendance rate goal for the state (i.e. 90%) or if the rate is greater than the attendance rate in the school year immediately preceding it, the school as a whole is deemed to have met the criterion.

If the rate is below the state goal and improvement has not been made based on the rate in the preceding year, a minus (-) is placed in the appropriate cell of the school profile. The final summary profile for Bush Elementary is provided below.

Summary of Bush Elementary Ratings Following Other Indicator Comparisons

	WS	AI	Asian	Hisp	Blk	Wht	IEP	LEP	L SES
--	----	----	-------	------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-------

¹⁸ Final federal regulation required, unexpectedly, that the step related to the other indicator be carried out for the school as a whole regardless of subject area performance. For all other subpopulations, the other indicator comparison (step 4) must only be carried out when step 2 is failed but step 3 is passed.

ELA Rate	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
MATH Rate	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
ELA Perf	+	+	+	+(RG)	+	+	+	+(RG)	+
MATH Perf	+(RG)	+	+	+	+	+	+(RG)	+	+(RG)
OI Perf	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-

A review of the table contents, in light of the previous table ratings, demonstrates that the Hispanic and Low SES subpopulations failed to meet the attendance criterion. Note that the actual attendance rate comparisons are not shown.

Once the final summary table of school ratings is complete, we can move to stage 2 of the AYP determination process.

Stage 2

Stage 2 represents the stage of analysis ending in the annual school AYP designations. To summarize stage 2, the school as a whole and its identifiable subpopulations are compared against criterion for participation rate, status performance, relative growth performance, and other indicator performance. Where applicable, this is done separately by subject area. Based on the comparisons, a school profile is constructed that includes a set of +s and –s.

Step 1 → Summarizing Ratings

In establishing the final school rating in a particular subject area, the ratings for each subpopulation are considered. Based on this review, with respect to participation rate or subject area performance (status and relative growth), any observed minus (-) results in a negative AYP classification for the particular subject area. An observed minus (-) for the other indicator also results in a negative AYP classification.

Summary of Bush Elementary Ratings Following Other Indicator Comparisons

	WS	AI	Asian	Hisp	Blk	Wht	IEP	LEP	L SES
ELA Rate	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
MATH Rate	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
ELA Perf	+	+	+	+(RG)	+	+	+	+(RG)	+
MATH Perf	+(RG)	+	+	+	+	+	+(RG)	+	+(RG)
OI Perf	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-

From the table, it follows that Bush Elementary would receive a negative AYP classification based on other indicator performance.

Step 2 → AYP Judgments

The AYP determinations for a school are made separately for English language arts and math. In the final analysis, a negative AYP classification in either subject area for the school results in AYP failure. The following table helps to distinguish AYP and Improvement Classifications based on English language arts and math ratings.

English Language Arts	Math	AYP Classification	Improvement Classification
+	+	Meets AYP	Okay
-	+	Fails AYP (ELA)	Watch (ELA)
+	-	Fails AYP (Math)	Watch (Math)
-	-	Fails AYP (Both)	Watch (Both)
(-) for other indicator		Fails AYP	Watch (other indicator)

The NCLB Act requires that a school that fails AYP for two consecutive years be classified as a school in need of improvement. Further, NCLB requires that AYP judgments are made separately in ELA and math. To accommodate this requirement, an “Improvement Classification” category has been developed. The following distinguishes AYP ratings across time and how they relate to school improvement designations.

Two-Year Classification Table

Year 1 AYP Classification	Year 2 AYP Classification	2-Year Classification
Meets AYP	Meets AYP	Okay
Meets AYP	Fails AYP (Math)	Watch (Math)
Meets AYP	Fails AYP (ELA)	Watch (ELA)
Fails AYP (ELA)	Meets AYP	Okay
Fails AYP (ELA)	Fails AYP (Math)	Watch (Math)
Fails AYP (Math)	Meets AYP	Okay
Fails AYP (Math)	Fails AYP (ELA)	Watch (ELA)
Fails AYP (ELA)	Fails AYP (ELA or Both)	School Improvement
Fails AYP (Math)	Fails AYP (Math or Both)	School Improvement
Fails AYP (Both)	Fails AYP (Any combination)	School Improvement

In other words, to be designated as needing improvement, a school must fail in English language arts for two consecutive years, in math for two consecutive years, in both subjects

simultaneously for two consecutive years, or relative to the other indicator for two consecutive years.

Conclusion

Described in this bulletin, with some detail, are the stages and steps taken in determining annual adequate yearly progress decisions. The Nevada model was built to comply with the tenets and prescriptions of the NCLB Act. In doing that, particular attention has been paid to taking steps that better ensure the reliability of the system and the validity of AYP interpretations.

The AYP determination process is the beginning of the accountability process. Care has been taken to enable the state to confidently support AYP decisions. Once these decisions have been made, the real work of assisting schools and school districts begins.